Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-231
Monday
4 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-000 *4 December 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

USSR Involvement in Hungarian Reductions Denied *[Budapest Radio]* 1
NATO Attitudes 'Changing for the Better' *[Solton on Moscow International]* 1
NATO Views Assessed, Joint Action Urged *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Gremitskikh Press Briefing 1 Dec 2
Navy Base in Cyprus 2
Situation in Central America 2
Anti-Soviet 'Vandalism' in Poland 2
'Hope' for Philippines' Normalization 2
Foreign Visits, Talks 2
L'UNITA Interviews Shevardnadze *[Milan L'UNITA 28 Nov]* 3
Kobysh, Zhurkin Debate European Trends *[IZVESTIYA 24 Nov]* 11
Zamyatin Views World Scene on Eve of Malta Meeting *[London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH 1 Dec]* 15

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush, Gorbachev Meet in Malta 2-3 Dec 17
Akhromeyev Previews Meeting *[Sofia TRUD 29 Nov]* 17
IZVESTIYA Previews Meeting *[2 Dec]* 17
U.S. Perceptions on Eve Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Dec]* 18
TASS Predicts 'Major Headway' 18
Value of Contacts Stressed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 19
TASS Views 'Yalta Phantom' 20
Gorbachev Arrives in Malta, Makes Statement *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Meets Maltese Premier *[TASS]* 21
Bush Arrives on Board 'Belknap' *[TASS]* 22
Gorbachev-Bush Talks Begin 2 Dec *[TASS]* 22
Correspondent on Start of Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 22
PRAVDA on Start of Meeting *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 23
Gorbachev, Bush Meet, Answer Questions *[Moscow TV]* 24
Weather Interrupts Meetings *[Moscow TV]* 24
First Phase of Talks Ends *[TASS]* 24
Baker, Shevardnadze on Significance *[TASS]* 24
More on Baker, Shevardnadze Remarks *[Moscow Radio]* 25
TASS Previews Next Round of Talks 25
Gorbachev, Bush Resume Talks 3 Dec *[TASS]* 26
Gerasimov Says Talks 'Proceeding Well' *[Moscow International]* 26
Gorbachev, Bush Hold News Conference *[Moscow International]* 26
Press Conference Statements *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 26
Statements to Correspondents *[TASS]* 28
More on Leaders' Comments to Press *[TASS]* 28
TASS on Meeting With Press *[TASS]* 29
Gorbachev TV Interview 31
PRAVDA Cites Gorbachev on Meeting *[4 Dec]* 31
Final Round of 'Maksim Gorkiy' Talks Noted *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 33
Baker on 'Constructive' Meeting *[TASS]* 34
Cheney Interviewed on Meeting *[TASS]* 34
'Most Important' Political Event *[Kornilov on TASS]* 34

Soltan Commentary on Results *[Moscow International]* 35
World Moving Toward 'New Era' *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 36
Meeting Ends, Gorbachev Departs Valletta *[TASS]* 36
Maltese Officials See Off Gorbachev *[TASS]* 37
Gorbachev Returns to Moscow *[TASS]* 37
Bush Departs Valletta for Brussels *[TASS]* 37
Bush Makes Brussels Arrival Statement *[TASS]* 37
Bush-Kohl Meeting, German Reunification Plan Noted *[TASS]* 37
Maltese Prime Minister Sees 'Era of Peace' *[TASS]* 38
Baltic States Appeal to Bush, Gorbachev *[Vilnius International]* 38
Intellectuals Send Message to Malta Meeting *[TASS]* 39
Spokesman on U.S. 'Interference' in Philippines *[Moscow International]* 39
U.S. Spokesman on Military Aid to Philippines *[TASS]* 39
Soviet-U.S. Talks Held on Fighting Drug Abuse *[TASS]* 40
USSR-U.S. Seminar on Cruise Missiles Opens *[TASS]* 40

China

Soviet-PRC Talks on Border Force Cuts Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 29 Nov]* 40
Tian Jiyun Cited on Increased PRC-USSR Trade *[TASS]* 40
PRC Economic, Agricultural Problems Noted *[Moscow TV]* 41

Northeast Asia

Japan Applauds Results of Malta Meeting *[TASS]* 41
Tikhonov Discusses Yakovlev's Visit to Japan *[Moscow International]* 41

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Coup Attempt Against Philippines' Aquino Reported 42
Military Disillusionment Seen as Factor *[Moscow International]* 42
Aquino Asks U.S. for Help *[Moscow International]* 43
Aquino Says Coup Attempt Thwarted *[TASS]* 43
U.S. 'Interference' Criticized *[Kuznetsov in PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 43

Near East & South Asia

Abalkin, Afghan Premier Discuss Economic Ties *[TASS]* 44
Supreme Soviet's Masaliyev Visiting Syria 44
Meets Assembly Head, Foreign Minister *[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]* 44
Visits Hydrotechnical Complex, Halab *[TASS]* 45
Received by President Al-Asad *[TASS]* 45
Israeli Agriculture Minister Interviewed on Visit *[TASS]* 45
UN Discussion on Palestine Ends 1 Dec *[TASS]* 45
Supreme Soviet Cables 'Arafat on 'Solidarity' Day *[Moscow International]* 46
Moves Toward Formation of Indian Government Noted *[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]* 47
New Prime Minister Sworn In *[TASS]* 47
Iranian Deputy on Iran-Soviet Armenia Ties *[ARMENPRES]* 47

Sub-Saharan Africa

U.S. Aid to Angolan Rebels Criticized *[Valentinov on Moscow International]* 47
RSA's De Klerk Praised for Reining in Army *[Fedorov on Moscow International]* 48
Supreme Soviet Group's Djibouti Visit Statement *[IZVESTIYA 26 Nov]* 49

East Europe

GDR Communists Demand Politburo Resignation *[TASS]* 49
SED Central Committee Resigns; Honecker Expelled *[TASS]* 50
Former SED Leaders Mittag, Tisch Arrested *[TASS]* 50
SED Leading Role Omitted From Constitution *[TASS]* 50

GDR Apologizes to CSSR for 1968 Invasion Role *[TASS]* 51
IZVESTIYA Interviews New Forum Leaders *[2 Dec]* 51
30 Nov Appeal to GDR Public to Support Socialism *[PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 52
ADN on Berlin People's Chain for Democracy *[TASS]* 52
Issue of German Reunification Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 27 Nov]* 53
BCP Chief Mladenov Interviewed on Reforms *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 55
Mladenov, Papazov Discuss Press Freedom *[PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 58
Bulgaria Says 1968 CSSR Invasion 'Unjustified' *[TASS]* 58
Soviet Commander Foresees Total CSSR Pullout *[London TV]* 59
Changed Appraisal of 1968 Intervention Noted *[Shakhin on Moscow International]* 60
CSSR Journalist Recalls 1968 Invasion *[Pacner in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 60
CPCZ Seen Under Increasing Pressure *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Dec]* 61
Urbanek Addresses National CPCZ Aktiv Meeting *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Nov]* 62
Agriculture Meeting Hears Urbanek on CPCZ Role *[TASS]* 62
CPCZ Presidium's Appeal to Communists Reported *[TASS]* 63
CPCZ 'Draft Action Program' Reported *[TASS]* 63
New CPCZ Presidium Member Benda Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* 64
Ceaucescu Says Economic Ties With USSR 'Secure' *[PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 65
RCP Central Committee To Meet 12 Dec *[TASS]* 65
Reportage on 14th Romanian Party Congress 65
PRAVDA Summarizes Congress *[25 Nov]* 65
Congress Resolution Summarized *[PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 66
Possible 'Forcible' Repatriation of Comaneci Seen *[TRUD 1 Dec]* 66
Outcome of Hungarian Referendum Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]* 66
Grosz Addresses MSZMP Activists 26 Nov *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 28 Nov]* 67
PZPR Official Condemns Anti-Soviet Vandalism *[Moscow Radio]* 68
PZPR's Miller Visits Polish Workers in Kursk *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Nov]* 68
Jaruzelski Chairs Defense Committee Session *[TASS]* 69
Greetings to SFRY Government, Party Leaders *[PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 69
Yazov Greets SFRY Counterpart on Republic Day *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Nov]* 69
Macedonian Council Delegation Arrives in Moscow *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 70
SFRY Economic, Political Problems Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 29 Nov]* 70
Soviet-Albanian Friendship Meeting Held *[TASS]* 71

West Europe

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Italy 71
Meets Milan Enterpreneurs *[Rome ANSA]* 71
PRAVDA on Meeting With Businessmen *[2 Dec]* 72
Speech to Italian Businessmen *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 74
Visits Milan, Meets Mayor *[Moscow TV]* 77
Addresses Milan City Council *[TASS]* 78
Gorbachev, Andreotti News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 78
More on News Briefing *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 83
Gorbachev Speaks to Press *[TASS]* 86
ANSA on Press Conference *[Rome ANSA]* 87
Gorbachev Meets Italian Party Leaders *[TASS]* 88
More on Talks With Party Heads *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 88
Gorbachev, Coalition Secretaries Confer *[PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 89
Gorbachev Remarks at Award Ceremony *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 89
Soviet, Foreign Press on Visit *[TASS]* 89
TASS Roundup of Visit 90
Paper Assesses Visit, Cites De Michelis *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Dec]* 91
Andreotti Pleased With Talks, Accords *[TASS]* 91
Andreotti Accepts Invitation to Visit *[TASS]* 92
Vatican Officials Comment *[TASS]* 92
Italian Rescue Workers Awarded *[TASS]* 92
Raisa Gorbecheva Visits Sicily *[TASS]* 92
Gorbachev Prefaces Italian Edition of Anthology *[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]* 93
Falin on German Reunification, One-Party Rule *[Hamburg BILD 4 Dec]* 94
Austrian Leaders Welcome Malta Meeting Results *[TASS]* 94

Soviet Problems Cause Austrian Visit Postponement *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 2-3 Dec]* 94
Academician on Space Cooperation With France *[IZVESTIYA 24 Nov]* 94

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. Evacuation, El Salvador Situation Viewed *[Bogomolov in PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 95
U.S. Ban on Panamanian Ships Part of 'Crusade' *[Petrovskaya on Radio Peace and Progress]* 95

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Lithuanian Party Plenum Proceedings Reported 97
Medvedev Notes 'Dangerous Trends' *[Vilnius Radio]* 97
Reads Gorbachev Message *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 97
Medvedev Elaborates *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 101
Medvedev Comments on Plenum *[Moscow TV]* 104
Vorgashorskaya Miners Take Vote on Ending Strike *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Dec]* 104
Decision To End Strike Made *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 105
Strike Ends as Main Demand Met *[TASS]* 105
Miners Resume Work *[TASS]* 105
'Conflict' Not Over *[Moscow International]* 106
Ryabev Briefs Newsmen on Miners' Demands *[PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 106
Vorkuta Situation, Ryabev Comments Examined *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 107
RSFSR Parliament on Measures on Vorkuta, Railways *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Dec]* 108
Miners' Living Conditions Described *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Nov]* 109
Armenian Party Central Committee Meets *[ARMENPRES]* 112
Further on Armenian, NKAO Joint Session *[Yerevan International]* 112
Armenia Votes for Unity With NKAO *[Moscow Radio]* 112
United Armenian Republic Proclaimed *[AFP]* 113
More on Armenian 'United Republic' *[Yerevan Radio]* 113
Supreme Soviet NKAO Decision Said 'Unjust' *[ARMENPRES]* 114
Resolution ' Another Insult' *[Yerevan International]* 114
Yerevan Paper on Decision *[Yerevan International]* 115
Tarazevich Discusses NKAO Decision *[Moscow TV]* 115
On Normalizing Situation *[TASS]* 116
Rail Blockade of Armenia Enters 5th Day *[Yerevan Radio]* 116
Committee Meets To Assess Costs *[ARMENPRES]* 116
Armenian Publication Says Dissidents Jailed *[Yerevan International]* 117
Earthquake Anniversary To Be Marked 7 Dec *[Yerevan Radio]* 117
Measures for Azerbaijan Railway Workers Examined *[Baku Radio]* 117
RSFSR Prepares for Congressional Elections *[TASS]* 117
Candidate Nominations Begin *[TASS]* 118
RSFSR Parliament Session Information Report *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Nov]* 118
AUCCTU Plenum To Open 4 Dec *[Moscow Radio]* 119
Uzbek Plenum Discusses Nationalities Policy *[TASS]* 119
Uzbekistan Obkom Party Secretary Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 119
New Uzbek Deputy Premier Appointed *[SOVET OZBEKISTONI 30 Nov]* 120
Akhmedov Elected Turkmenistan Premier *[Moscow Radio]* 120
Gasoline 'Crisis' Impedes Tajik Road Traffic *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* 120
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Holds Session *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* 120
Deputy Views Ukrainian People's Movements *[Vilnius Radio]* 121
Ukrainian Uniate Church To Be Registered *[Moscow International]* 121
Ukraine Procurator's Office Clears Militia *[Kiev International]* 122
Belorussian Supreme Soviet To Discuss Elections *[Moscow Radio]* 122
Belorussian Immigration Figures Published *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 12 Nov]* 122
Belorussian Law on Constitutional Changes *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 4 Nov]* 122
Lithuanian Party Action Program Published *[TASS]* 123
IAEA Experts Visit Lithuanian AES *[TASS]* 123
Latvian Social Democratic Party Convenes in Riga *[TASS]* 124
Congress Ends 3 Dec *[TASS]* 124

Latvian Parliament Presidium Discusses Draft Laws *[Riga Radio]* 124
Estonian Supreme Soviet To Meet 6 Dec *[Tallinn Radio]* 124
Estonian Labor Collectives on Elections *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 2 Nov]* 124
Estonian Komsomol Sets March Dissolution Deadline
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Nov] 125
Estonia's Ryuytel on Republic Sovereignty *[Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 24 Nov]* 125
Law on Republican Economic Autonomy *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 126
Sobchak on Baltic Supreme Soviet Walkout *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 47]* 128
Opinion Poll Conducted on Interethnic Relations *[TASS]* 128
Bakatin speaks at Komsomol School *[Moscow Radio]* 128
Baklanov Visits Test Flight Institute *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 128
Biryukova Visits Ivanteyevka Knitwear Factory *[Moscow Radio]* 129
Meets With Workers *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 129
Lukyanov on Supreme Soviet Second Session *[TASS]* 130
Medvedev Addresses Science Conference *[TASS]* 130
Pugo Addresses Session of Gdlyan Commission *[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* 131
Sakharov Calls for Strike To Challenge Party *[AFP]* 131
Kharkov To Commemorate Victims of Repression, War *[IZVESTIYA 21 Nov]* 132

Scientific

Details Given on 'Mir' Space Activities 132
'Progress M' Burns in Atmosphere *[TASS]* 132
'Kvant-Mir' Docking Postponed *[TASS]* 132
'Kvant' Problems Detailed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Nov]* 132
Further Details on Problems *[Moscow Radio]* 133
Flight Path Adjusted *[TASS]* 133
'Granat' Astrophysical Observatory Launched 134
Launch Announcement *[Moscow Radio]* 134
Further Details *[TASS]* 134
Orbital Parameters Given *[TASS]* 134
Research Program Outlined *[TASS]* 134
To Function 8 Months *[TASS]* 135

USSR Involvement in Hungarian Reductions Denied

LD0112220989 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2100 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Excerpt] One day before the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the Hungarian premier has announced that our country is reducing its armed forces. To my question, a spokesman for the Defense Ministry denied that Budapest might have coordinated this measure with Moscow, although from his words it is not precluded that the Soviet leadership might have known of the Hungarian plans, which perhaps might dovetail in with its own arm limitation plans. [passage omitted covered by ref item]

NATO Attitudes 'Changing for the Better'

LD2711164289 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 27 NOV 89

[Text] November 27th marks the beginning of the NATO autumn session in Brussels. East-West relations will be at the top of the agenda. Yuriy Solton is trying to forecast the outcome of the session.

The session is expected to be dominated by Soviet perestroyka, the sweeping changes in Eastern europe and the coming Soviet-American summit off the Maltan coast. That follows from a series of recent statements by NATO leaders. They are increasingly often speaking for shifting the bloc's priorities from the military to political aspects. This view has been expressed for instance by the NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner. This seems to be a good sign. A number of West Europe leaders have also said they won't take advantage of the situation shaping up in Europe to restore political confrontation. The recent meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and the Polish prime minister, Tadeusz Mazowiecki, showed that the Soviet leaders, too, favour a stable Europe.

At the same time some West European leaders seem to be apprehensive about the Soviet-American summit, planned for this weekend. While giving it a welcome and calling it important, they fear the two great powers may decide between themselves upon the future European politics. In fact there is no warrant for such concern—the White House and the Kremlin are unable and unwilling to shape Europe's future. True, the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, has admitted in an interview with Soviet television that certain priorities might be set given the dynamic events in Eastern Europe, but, he said, European problems would be only part of the big agenda. The United States President George Bush has also denied that the summit is designed to shape Europe's future. He said it was rather to help abolish the policy of containment and Cold War. As for the future of the two political alliances, they are perhaps to retain their roles for some time. They will be disbanded when the military confrontation is reduced low enough by disarmament.

So far a shift of priorities to politics seems to be the main goal. That understanding is shared by some of the NATO leaders. True, other leaders are calling for a further military build-up, preserving tactical nuclear arms and keeping the military spendings high. There's no doubt, however, that NATO's attitudes have been changing for the better.

NATO Views Assessed, Joint Action Urged

LD0312083989 Moscow TASS in English 0819 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS—"Under the influence of new political thinking pursued by the Soviet Union in international relations, several NATO countries are beginning to change, though insufficiently, their approach to solving vital global problems, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA said in a comment on Saturday.

In documents adopted last week, NATO's Euro-group, the Military Committee and the Defence Planning Committee for the first time admitted the historic importance of developments in socialist countries and their impact on East-West relations and on peace in Europe.

NATO praised the progress in the Vienna conventional arms reductions talks in Europe and a constructive and positive position of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA lauded West German intentions to reduce its armed forces and similar discussions in the United States.

"However, some actions by NATO and its leading members appear to be a glaring anachronism against the background of improving international climate," the paper said.

"NATO governing bodies recently pledged to continue their deterrent policy, saying it was a condition for a constructive dialogue with the Warsaw Treaty Organisation."

"NATO claims that the presence of the U.S. nuclear and conventional forces in Europe is vitally important for European security."

"There is little optimism in the fact that military budgets and programmes in the United States and other NATO countries still regard military force as the major means of achieving designated foreign policy objectives."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA called on the East and West to take joint efforts for lasting peace and comprehensive security.

"Lasting peace and mutual security can only be achieved through serious changes in the East and West. In promoting change, the sides shall discard out-dated stereotypes, observe the balance of interests and respect the right of nations to freely choose their systems," KRASNAYA ZVEZDA said.

TASS Reports Gremitskikh Press Briefing 1 Dec

Navy Base in Cyprus

LD0112151189 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yiriy Gremitskikh has described as "absurd" a British newspaper's claims that the Soviet Navy maintained a base, named Cape Andreas, on the northern coast of Cyprus.

Commenting on an article in THE GUARDIAN newspaper at today's briefing, Gremitskikh pointed out that "In Cyprus, the more so in its northern part controlled by troops of Turkey which is a member of the north atlantic alliance, the USSR has never had, nor can have any bases."

The USSR does not view this attempt to peddle disinformation about mythical Soviet naval bases on the eve of Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with George Bush as an "accident or mistake", Gremitskikh said.

It seems that there are some people who would like to delude public opinion, he added.

Situation in Central America

LD0112162689 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—"There are unfortunately no appreciable changes so far towards normalisation in Central America," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing today.

"The mechanism of Central American 'five' summits, which has proved its worth, could become the most adequate forum to consider a way out of the complex situation," he said. "Since Central American countries have no consensus on Managua as the venue, it could well be held in some other place—there are proposals to that effect," Gremitskikh said. "The main thing is now for the sides to renew the negotiations and agree on a ceasefire. The Soviet Union favours such an approach and is ready to actively promote it. The Soviet Union will certainly continue efforts towards promoting an early normalisation of the situation in the region and in other areas," Gremitskikh said.

Anti-Soviet 'Vandalism' in Poland

LD0112161889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1431 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 1 Dec (TASS)—Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, during a briefing in Moscow today, expressed the deep concern of the Soviet side at the acts of vandalism regarding the monument to V.I. Lenin in the Polish city of Krakow. He recalled that on 29 November, extremist youth groupings undertook actions in Nowa Huta, the workingclass district of Krakow where the monument stands, which are assessed in the Soviet Union as an anti-Soviet escapade in relation to the creator of the Soviet state.

It was noted at the briefing that measures cutting that act short were taken by the Polish authorities on this occasion. It was stressed that extreme regret is caused by the fact that what happened in Poland was not an isolated instance in recent times of the defilement of places which are memorable to the people of the two countries. To judge by all appearances, the Soviet spokesman stated, certain forces are obviously not at home with the process of good-neighbourly relations with the USSR which are developing normally.

'Hope' for Philippines' Normalization

LD0212081989 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—A spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry stated today that "the very fact of the destabilisation of the internal life of the Philippines, which is friendly to us, cannot but arouse our concern."

"We express hope that the government and the people of that country will manage themselves to normalise the situation and cope with the arisen difficulties," he said.

In answer to the question as to how does the Soviet Union reacts to the U.S. military action in the Philippines, the spokesman stated that "we unambiguously declare against interference in the affairs of any state."

Foreign Visits, Talks

LD0112211989 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—The programme of the forthcoming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush was announced at today's briefing by Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh.

The leaders of the two countries will hold negotiations on board the Soviet cruiser Slava on December 2 and on board the U.S. cruiser Belknap on December 3.

Commenting on article in the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN, which claims that the Soviet Navy maintains a base, named Cape Andreas, on the northern coast of Cyprus, Gremitskikh said: "In Cyprus, the more so in its northern part, controlled by troops of Turkey, which is a member of the North Atlantic alliance, the USSR has never had, nor can have any bases."

The Middle East settlement is one of the priority regional problems for the Soviet foreign policy, the spokesman said, commenting on an address of participants in a recent session of the council of the League of Arab States to Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush in connection with their forthcoming meeting off Malta.

He said this theme holds an important place in the Soviet-American political debates. The Soviet Union is

for constructive interaction with the United States in achieving normalisation in the Middle East.

During the briefing Gremitskikh confirmed the fact of the recent meetings of the Soviet ambassadors to Managua and Havana with official representatives of Nicaragua and Cuba. He stressed that questions related to the situation in Central America were also discussed at these meetings.

Israeli Agriculture Minister Avraham Katz-'oz staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of Soviet agricultural firms and scientific circles, had meetings with Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, with academician Aleksandr Nikonov, president of the All-Union V.I. Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, with Yuriy Luzhkov, chairman of the Moscow State Agro-Industrial Complex. The minister also visited the Istra state farm near Moscow, the spokesman said.

Gremitskikh summed up the results of a visit to France from November 27 to 30 by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy.

The spokesman said that an arrangement had been reached during the visit to impart a systematic character to a dialogue between the foreign policy agencies of the two countries, specifically in the settlement of regional conflicts.

Positively appraising the results of a visit to Moscow by Raja Shahid Zafar, Pakistan's minister of state for production, the spokesman noted that an early settlement to the Afghan problem would promote a dynamic development of bilateral relations, also in the economic area.

The spokesman said that the question of the release of Soviet servicemen kept prisoner by the armed Afghan opposition was also discussed during the conversations with the Pakistani minister.

The Soviet side expressed the hope that Pakistan's leaders will continue to contribute to the solution of this humanitarian problem.

Continuing the Afghan theme, Gremitskikh pointed out that a meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and former King of Afghanistan Zahir Shah in Rome was viewed in the Republic of Afghanistan as an indicator of the fact that the Soviet Union takes vigorous measures for the quest of the ways for a peaceful settlement of the Afghan problem.

Noting that a Soviet delegation headed by First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Lev Voronin, is now on a visit in Turkey, the spokesman said that development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and Turkey is discussed during the visit.

Concluding the briefing, Gremitskikh expressed profound concern of the Soviet side over acts of vandalism with regard to the monument to Lenin, that took place in the Polish city of Krakow on November 29.

"By all indications, some forces clearly dislike the fact that goodneighbourly relations are normally developing with the Soviet Union," the spokesman said.

L'UNITA Interviews Shevardnadze

PM0112172089 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 28 Nov 89 pp 11-13

[Massimo D'Alema and Sergio Sergi interview with USSR Foreign Minister Edvard Shevardnadze in Moscow 25 November, followed by written answers to questions submitted in advance]

[Text] D'Alema: We are very pleased to be able to publish such a major and in-depth interview.

Shevardnadze: I am grateful for the choice you made and am aware of my responsibilities in an interview with such a popular newspaper, especially since it coincides with Mikhail Gorbachev's visit—a major event in the life of our peoples and countries. And if we consider the documents that have been prepared, I must say that it is a very significant visit in the context of the European situation. The principal document is certainly the Soviet-Italian joint declaration: It is a very important document in bilateral relations but also within a broader context. I do not know whether I have succeeded in answering your questions exhaustively (the written answers to our questions are published separately—L'UNITA editor's note), in view of Italian readers' expectations. I fear the text is rather long; today's reader is not fond of vast tomes.

D'Alema: The interview is so important and interesting that it raises no problems of space. We have just finished publishing the proceedings of our party's Central Committee session, including at least 200 speeches.

Shevardnadze: I know you had a tough debate within your Central Committee. I do not know all the details of the discussion, but I believe an open debate is under way. Arguments no longer surprise us....

D'Alema: We have embarked on a very far-reaching change of course and are setting ourselves the objective of establishing a new Italian leftwing force. We intend to bring together all the forces wanting to build an alternative in our country. Of course, it is an ambitious aim and it is natural for such an option to have prompted a major debate within the party. The world is changing very fast and the Left must seek paths of this kind—especially in a country such as ours, where we believe there exist both the necessity and the possibility of at last forging a government alternative, of surmounting a deadlocked situation. The same party has governed for 40 years. This decision by the PCI [Italian Communist Party] is prompting a broad exchange of views not only within the party but throughout the country.

Shevardnadze: I looked with great interest at the reports of the recent meeting between Gorbachev and Achille Occhetto. I can say that in-depth and extended deliberations

took place. From my reading of that account, I gained the certainty that our Italian friends are seeking new approaches, new paths to the further development of their course. We know it is no ordinary event: It is a complex process. I can say that we are following the processes occurring in Italy and also within your party with enormous interest. Our interest has always been great.

D'Alema: I do not want to take advantage of the little time available to us [as published]. I would like to broach a number of new issues that have emerged since our questions were submitted. They are major issues. We have entered an era in which the succession of events is very rapid. Major innovations can occur within just a few days. Nobody could have believed that a specific debate would begin the possibility of Germany's reunification. And yet such a debate has begun. Of course it also entails certain aspects that are not positive, because certain stances are revanchist. But there are also those who are approaching this issue more realistically. Within this realistic context, do you consider a process for Germany's reunification possible?

Shevardnadze: This is one of the most complex and delicate issues. With regard to the European situation, the all-European process, and the building of the "common European home," we have tried to formulate our approaches and principled viewpoints. There are new approaches with regard to the "new Europe"—courageous and principled approaches. The complete elimination of the military contraposition, the creation of a legal dimension, a free economic dimension: These are all real prospects. But the lessons of history must not be ignored; they must not be forgotten. What is the real situation? It is that which came about after the war. This situation is largely based on the existence of two independent and sovereign German states. To ignore this situation could grant new vigor to the revanchist forces. The fact is that there is something of a backlash. Future generations will not thank us if we view the revanchist phenomena complacently. It is no coincidence that I answered one of your questions by saying that if on the eve of World War II the ranks of communist and social democratic workers' forces had pooled their resources, the conflict could have been averted. I believe that Europe's territorial order cannot be revised. Gorbachev, answering a similar question, said that it is difficult to hypothesize about what will happen in 100 years' time. I believe that for the foreseeable future we must proceed from the existing situation.

D'Alema: A major political crisis has arisen recently in Czechoslovakia. Your answers outline a new concept of the Warsaw Pact military alliance and of relations between its member states. In any case, this concept has already been put into practice. A mischievous thought occurred to us: If this new concept had already existed in 1968, perhaps the situation in Czechoslovakia would be less serious now...

Shevardnadze: Yes, I agree that it really is a mischievous question. I believe what is happening in Czechoslovakia is natural. What is the most important characteristic of these processes, which are also occurring in the USSR and other socialist countries? The main trend is the democratization of society, the forging of a democratic form of socialism. What is happening in Czechoslovakia is precisely this process of democratization and revitalization. I believe it is for the Czechoslovaks themselves to say whether a real link exists between what is happening now and what happened in 1968. As you know, we greatly respect this principle and value it highly: It is the principle of free choice, of noninterference. These principles have always been proclaimed, but were not always honored. Now we pursue them scrupulously and ensure that our words do not diverge fom our deeds. There was a demonstration in Prague on 17 November, and the leadership's stance toward it was negative. Perhaps the government and administrative bodies did not act in the most felicitous way. Now, however, another kind of analysis and different conclusions exist. We must not interfere so as not to impose on the Czechoslovak comrades a solution of the situation, of the events of the present and the past. I am sure that this will happen.

D'Alema: Very clear and lucid statements have been made with regard to the intervention in Afghanistan. It was an event that constituted a serious error, a violation of principles.

Shevardnadze: Yes, but it took time to reach such a conclusion. I was only able to say these things at the end of 1989. Even before that, however, I was convinced that there had been errors. Nevertheless it was necessary to reappraise everything yet again in order to reach a correct decision.

D'Alema: I greatly appreciated—above all from a principled viewpoint—the theoretical formulation transcending the concept of the class struggle as a fundamental element of international relations—a concept that has actually caused much harm.

Shevardnadze: In that instance the class struggle was not the only aspect involved. Even before, we used to say that the character of international relations is determined by the opposing positions of the two systems. Bearing in mind the nuclear threat, the ecological disaster, and the economic catastrophe, if we had continued to proceed from that principle the only option left open to us would have been war. It is an elementary conclusion: either confrontation or cooperation for the salvation of civilization. If we are talking about communist ideals, this is the sacrosanct struggle. This is our world revolution. It is not the world revolution that our predecessors spoke of: It is a revolution to salvage civilization. But we must cooperate with everyone. We now talk not only about mutual understanding but also about the interaction of the various forces to resolve global problems. So, it is not only a matter of coexistence. Yes, the world is changing rapidly, so principled agreements must also be changed. We will encounter difficulties in instances where we are lagging behind with regard to global issues but also in domestic matters. If we had started perestroyka 15-20 years ago, the process

would have gone differently. The same applies to foreign policy: If environmental issues had been broached 30-40 years ago as concretely as they are being broached now, the world situation would have been entirely different. The same could be said with regard to the international economic order.

D'Alema: All this does not diminish the value of that great initiative for renewal, perestroyka.

Shevardnadze: Certainly....

D'Alema: The crisis in the East European countries would certainly be less serious.

Shevardnadze: Definitely. Apart from anything else, perestroyka entails the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. Many difficulties that we have come up against are of a social nature. But they could have been resolved 15-30 years ago. There should have been different approaches: Our potential—including our scientific potential— was huge. Obviously this does not diminish the significance of perestroyka. The situation is difficult, but I must state openly that we are not in a crisis situation. I disagree with many of my comrades who say repeatedly that we are facing a crisis and a disaster. The people have roused themselves, very intensive activity is going on, and we have overcome the worst trouble—that of indifference, political apathy. There are no longer any indifferent people in our country. This seems to me the most important result of our peaceful revolution. We will succeed, I have no doubt.

D'Alema: Rather than indifference, there is political ferment now. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet is now discussing the possibility of permitting the establishment of other parties. The second secretary of the Lithuanian party has said that it is natural. It is natural to envisage the emergence of other parties....

Shevardnadze: This is being discussed. However, it is necessary to proceed from the fact that a new constitution does not yet exist. The present constitution is obsolete, but until a new and better legal framework has been drawn up we cannot ignore this constitution. This is normal behavior for any country, especially since this is the constitution of a federal state.

Sergi: The important thing, as you often say, is not to allow yourselves to be overtaken by the events taking place within society....

Shevardnadze: I agree.

Sergi: But does such a danger exist?

Shevardnadze: Yes, this danger does exist if we do not act promptly. It would be ideal if the law on ownership had been approved 3 years ago.

Sergi: But it will not even be approved in Decemoer, at the next session of the "Congress of People's Deputies"....

Shevardnadze: The law is based on production relations. It is no easy matter because it concerns the whole of society, every family. This is why 3-4 years ago we were not ready to propose the new regulations on ownership to our people. Even if the lease law had been approved 3-4 years ago, the situation would be very different. The same applies to a number of other matters. However, laws are not created so easily. If we had proposed to society the platform on the nationalities issue, perhaps we would not have experienced the difficulties and even upheavals. It took time.

Sergi: Meanwhile the Lithuanian Communist Party is preparing to hold a congress at which it will perhaps decide to declare itself an independent party.

Shevardnadze: We have recently consulted with the Lithuanian comrades. If the principle of party federalism were to become established I believe it would conflict with the interests of perestroyka and democratization. This is so because at present—and for the immediate future—the party remains the principal force of all classes, social groups, nations, and republics. We have no other more reliable instrument for implementing glasnost and the renewal of the party itself. This is a fact. The fact that in 10-15 years' time, or slightly sooner, we will perhaps look at this matter differently is another matter. Nothing is eternal. As you know, in communism and scientific socialism there exists the theory of transcending the state. I do not know which generation will be able to implement this theory. At present without the party we cannot complete the reform process—a process that the party itself initiated and that the party must lead in order to achieve the set objectives.

D'Alema: The television newsreel called Polish Prime Minister Mazowiecki "comrade." At a recent Warsaw Pact meeting, you yourself said that it was now necessary to consider, to become accustomed to, addressing certain participants as "Prime Minister."

Shevardnadze: At a protocol ceremony the form of address "Prime Minister" was indeed used....

Sergi: It was the television newsreel announcer who referred to the Catholic Mazowiecki as "Comrade"....

Shevardnadze: Our commentators often confuse matters. Many important events are happening in Poland.

Sergi: Romania is the only place where they are not happening....

Shevardnadze: This too is an internal matter for that country. We must have the utmost respect for the sovereignty and autonomy of any party.

D'Alema: In any case, perestroyka has spread without the need for interventions....

Shevardnadze: I believe that the best way to display adherence to socialist and communist ideals is to give an example in the building of a new society and a new view of socialism. This is stronger than any army or the slogan of world revolution. This was one of Lenin's theses.

D'Alema: ...because socialism can only win if it enjoys the people's support. I believe it will take a long time for a new world thrust toward socialism to become established. Capitalism has achieved successes in this era and has displayed a great capacity for developing the production forces and increasing wealth. But it has also created injustices and contradictions—from which, however, a new phase in the struggle for socialism could also proceed. This also requires a great deal of theoretical work. Some theories have proven weak, such as the idea of the collapse of capitalism.

Shevardnadze: I agree: There is much that must be revised. If I remember correctly, Nikita Khrushchev once shouted at the Americans: We will bury you. Or people would say: The outlines of communism can be seen, and in 20 years' time communist society will be created. I believe these were sincere illusions, just as people sincerely believed in world revolution. I do not like making forecasts, especially about the future of a political system. In my opinion, the capitalist countries, including the developed ones, will experience difficulties, too. When I addressed the United Nations I recalled the U.S. crisis of the 1930's: At that time the Americans themselves spoke in terms of the collapse of capitalism, and it must be remembered that no less than 100,000 of them applied to emigrate to the USSR. Really extraordinary measures were needed to surmount that crisis. I believe that the foreign debt problem has not been properly analyzed, and the same applies to that of the clash between the developed countries and the area of underdevelopment. This is the most acute international problem. I believe that some of the prosperity achieved by the developed capitalist countries—though not by all—is not due solely to the great productivity of labor and technological progress. Let us consider the channels for the transfer of capital from the developed world to the developing world: Astronomical figures are involved. I told the Polish leaders: Many people believe that the West will help us. Of course, at some stage the West will help us. But consider the figures: From 1971 through 1988 they had credits worth $47 billion, but paid interest totalling $52 billion. Consider where the money went. Take Brazil or Argentina or other Latin American and African states; take Mexico: The situation there is catastrophic. Unless a reasonable solution is found, unless a new economic order is established, a disaster will ensue. The Brazilian president revealed to me that his country's exports exceed imports by 16-20 percent: Well, this is an ideal situation. But many countries are not in such a position. Their money goes to cover interest and is often insufficient. As you can see, there are many contradictions. This is why I do not want to idealize the situation of the Eastern European countries. A month and a half ago U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney warned U.S. society that the USSR was improving its armaments and recommended remaining vigilant and not falling behind. A month and a half later, however, he argued that there is a real prospect of a reduction in U.S. armaments by $180 billion. What has happened in such a short space of time? Did he suddenly think that the Soviets had all changed? No, the fact is that the Americans have started analyzing their country's economic situation. And they have discovered that the image of the USSR as an enemy is collapsing. It must also be borne in mind that it was not easy for Cheney to make such a statement. Now the secretary risks losing the backing of the military-political complex. The move was probably dictated by the country's domestic problems. Perhaps the capitalist countries will have to confront problems within a certain period of time. We do not want this to happen. We are in favor of joining forces and finding solutions to get out of the blind alley.

D'Alema: Our conversation is growing long and full of substance. I would not want you....

Sergi: ...to be late for your meetings in Rome and the Malta summit....

Shevardnadze: In that event, this interview would prove pointless....

D'Alema: What a strange idea it is to go to sea—especially at this time of year. It could be choppy on board ship....

Shevardnadze: Our ships are safe and heavy. If the weather is bad, we could draw closer to shore.

Sergi: To the delight of journalists waiting on the island.

Shevardnadze: This is a problem: how to organize the journalists' work. It will be difficult to accommodate them on board. Various possibilities for establishing contacts are being considered, including a link between the ship and the press center.... There is something else I would now like to add. I noticed that one of your questions refers to the socialist and progressive forces. I do honestly deliberate on this matter. I have given general answers, and probably in the future I will be able to go into detail. A more thorough examination must be made of what has happened and what will now ensue, what the prospects are. It is one of the most interesting topics. But it is not only a topic for deliberation; it is also a practical matter.

D'Alema: When we witness the transformation on the part of the Hungarian Communists, who are becoming socialists and asking to join the Socialist International, this is practice and no longer theory. Many years ago they would have been called traitors. Now nobody believes it any more. This shows that many things have changed.

Shevardnadze: These are the words that were used then.... Now I thank you again for your visit. Comrade Gorbachev knew about our meeting and was sorry not to have been able to meet with you, but we beg your understanding, because his workload is truly superhuman.

D'Alema: Indeed one does wonder how he manages to endure such a huge workload.

Shevardnadze: It really is a superhuman task. He asked me to convey his greetings and congratulations to the PCI leadership and to Comrade Occhetto, with whom he will be meeting in Rome.

"We Propose to Bush an Agreement on Major Guiding Ideas"

[L'UNITA] We are on the eve of Gorbachev's visit to our country. What is your assessment of relations between the USSR and Italy? In your opinion, what contribution could Italy make within the NATO and EEC contexts to new political and economic relations between East and West?

[Shevardnadze] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Italy—the first in history by a Soviet head of state—undoubtedly constitutes a very important event in European and world politics, and will raise the dialogue and cooperation in all fields between the Soviet Union and Italy to a new level. I say this with certainty, not only in view of the USSR's and Italy's world role, but also on account of the fact that relations between our two countries have solid foundations and have grown stronger in recent years under the influence of perestroyka and the "new way of thinking." Many initiatives by our countries at the European and world level have often been of a pioneering character and have opened up new opportunities and fields of action both in economic cooperation and in the development of the European process. Italian-Soviet relations are characterized by the shared willingness to discuss a wide range of international topics in a frank and concrete manner. It is a dialogue between truly committed interlocutors. The USSR has always recognized Italian leaders' political realism and their sensitive perception of international novelties. Personally, I cannot fail to recall with great pleasure my lively and very interesting meetings with Giulio Andreotti and the meaningful conversation that I had in New York in September with Foreign Minister Gianni De Michelis, with whom a good contact was immediately established. I am pleased with the high level of our relations in the economic field. Italy—traditionally one of the Soviet Union's leading partners—now occupies only fourth position in our exchanges with the Western nations. But of course, since the restructuring of the economic mechanisms in our country is directed partly toward integration in the system of world economic relations, entirely new horizons are opening up with regard to both the forms and the dimensions of future cooperation. Now I will move on to the second part of the question. I set Italy's possible contribution—and that of any other European country—to new economic and political relations between East and West within the broadest possible outlook. The Europeans' historical memory bears the imprint of the gains of the Renaissance era, which opened up entirely new horizons to everyone. It is not my place to talk to you about the role that the Italian states played in the Renaissance. What Europe is experiencing now is in many respects reminiscent of the turning points that have marked its destiny during the course of history. For the first time we are acknowledging—and not just as a mere philosophical conceit but as a diplomatic blueprint—the possibility of building a common European home and are defining the specific roads to a rapprochement among all European peoples. I am am sure that Italy can make its own original contribution to this vital process: Its great traditions and the constructive nature of its present policy will certainly leave a mark on the architecture of the all-European home.

Unprecedented Summit Between Gorbachev and Bush

[L'UNITA] What do expect from the coming summit between Bush and Gorbachev? Is there a possibility of new agreements on strategic nuclear disarmament?

[Shevardnadze] I believe in its own way the meeting will be unique, different from any other Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. There will not be a rigid agenda. It will be an open and free-ranging dialogue on the major topics of the moment. The meeting will not end with the signing of preestablished accords, but I would not rule out the attainment off Malta of agreements on fundamental options capable of enriching Soviet-U.S. relations with new political substance and new formulations and of imparting a vigorous boost to their progressive development. This also applies to the issue of offensive strategic weapons which you mentioned. Proposals permitting the solution of the basic obstacles to a future agreement are currently on the negotiating table. From our viewpoint, it will soon be possible to reach the establishment of a START agreement, despite all the complexity of the still-unresolved problems. The year 1990 really could become a turning point in disarmament. I would point out in this regard that the reference point for Soviet-U.S. relations remains Gorbachev's official visit to the United States in the spring and early summer of next year.

Conventional Forces: Accord Taking Shape

[L'UNITA] The reduction of conventional forces in Europe is of crucial importance in the context of disarmament policy. What is your verdict on the status of the negotiations in this field? Does the USSR intend to put forward new proposals? If so, would they be partly with a view to averting the transfer of the F-16's to Crotone?

[Shevardnadze] On the whole, we are satisfied with the Vienna negotiations on conventional armed forces. In this forum, both sides have put forward clear-cut proposals which, moreover, coincide on a number of parameters. Considerable progress has already occurred, and detailed work is going on to find solutions to difficult problems. Therefore, it is realistic to expect a rapid conclusion of an accord on armaments in Europe. We have proposed convening a summit meeting of European states in the second half of 1990 to complete this work. Of course complex problems remain unresolved in Vienna—such as those of the armed forces, troop numbers, and arms stockpiles. Documents must be agreed on covering controls, the exchange of information, and balancing measures, thus laying the essential foundations for the future accord. We believe that the plans for

the transfer of the F-16 aircraft to Crotone must be examined within this context. With regard to possible future new proposals on our part, it must be said that at virtually every session of the Vienna negotiations we have taken initiatives aimed at finding solutions acceptable to both sides. In the future too, we will pursue an active line, counting, of course, on our partners' willingness to reciprocate.

[L'UNITA] Hitherto the USSR and the United States have been the protagonists of a new phase of relations between the opposing political and military blocs. What role can Europe play? I am referring not only to Western Europe but also to the European countries allied to the USSR. Is it possible to envisage a new European order transcending that which emerged from World War II?

[Shevardnadze] Participation in the development of relations between the two politico-military alliances is not the exclusive privilege of the USSR and the United States. In the new phase to which you refer—the transition phase from contraposition to cooperation—an extraordinarily important role has been played by the European countries of both alignments. Moreover, this role has been constructive and in many respects has determined the new positive characteristics of international relations. Now that the option for mutual understanding and cooperation has been made, all European countries face the task of developing this thrust toward a new era of peace, toward a Europe that combines positive internal development with cooperation between the states for mutual benefit and the continent's stability. The European socialist states advocate the transition to a radically different concept of European security—a concept based on political, not military means. The Warsaw Pact countries are in favor of the creation of a common legal basis as the foundation of relations between all European states, while at the same time supporting the promotion of economic relations and European integrative process. This would encourage gradual rapprochement between East and West Europe and basically the creation of a new postwar European order. Fundamental factors in this new order would include a sharp reduction of the foreign military presence and a substantial reduction of the role of military factors in European politics. Lastly, the outcome of a new European order could be the dismantling of the military blocs, in other words, a situation whereby there are no foreign troops in any country. The road to such a new order in Europe depends initially on progress from contraposition to political convergence between the two blocs and the subsequent attainment of the complete demobilization of their military organizations. Against the background of such a process of demilitarization, a broad economic integration of the continent could take place and a flourishing common European home open to the everyone could be built.

Nobody Can Impose Their Own Models

[L'UNITA] Very far-reaching political changes are under way in Eastern Europe. The development of political democracy and pluralism in various countries is producing a change of leadership forces. In Poland, for instance, a government headed by noncommunist forces has been formed. A process similar in some respects is taking place in Hungary. How do you judge these changes? What consequences could they have for political, military, and economic relations within the Warsaw Pact?

[Shevardnadze] Obviously the world around us cannot be regarded as dormant, and its social, political, and economic structures as set forever and unchangeable. Faced with the changes in our allied countries, of course our attitude is not one of indifference and unconcern, but we are behaving calmly, with a reflective approach, with confidence, both toward those who share our ideas and toward those who, together with them, are taking charge of the future of their respective peoples and states. The nature of the Warsaw Pact rules out any interference in the internal affairs of allied countries or other states. Having said that, however, there is another point that I am absolutely clear about: Any external interference in the affairs of the Warsaw Pact and its member states must also be ruled out at the same time. There is an indissoluble dialectical connection between these concepts. The nature of our alliance—the Warsaw Pact Organization—has changed profoundly. The processes of renewal of its member states could not fail to involve the nature of the organization itself. The main trend of development is the democratization of relations, the transformation of the Pact into a politico-military alliance, and the enlargement of fields of nonmilitary cooperation. The Warsaw Pact states intend to build their relations on the basis of equality, independence, and each state's right to freely formulate its own policy line. Nobody in the Warsaw Pact has a monopoly on the truth or a "right" to paternalism or hegemony. Nobody imposes its own models. In the past 5 years there has become established within the alliance a spirit of genuine solidarity; frankness; and pluralism of opinions, stances, and assessments of events. There are also disagreements and contrasts, but there is also agreement on a broad range of international issues, including the most burning and critical ones.

New Order for Postwar Europe

[L'UNITA] East-West relations are moving on from the phase of confrontation to that of cooperation. Do you believe it is possible to envisage a future gradual transcending of the two military blocs—NATO and the Warsaw Pact?

[Shevardnadze] This is precisely the aim of the Warsaw Pact members states. Indeed at the present time, thanks to the efforts of the states of both East and West, for the first time since the war, in Europe and more generally throughout the world, there is emerging a real possibility of a gradual dismantling of the model of security that took shape during the "cold war" years and that was based essentially on military contraposition, on military strength. The transition has begun toward a quantitatively new international order that will base East-West relations on entirely different

principles. The gradual development of the factors leading to the future European order is already driving toward a fundamental change in the military alliances' role, in the very nature of their activity. NATO and the Warsaw Pact—which was created 6 years later—were basically the result of a mentality and policy of confrontation. However, this does not mean that they will disappear instantly, with the wave of a magic wand. The dismantling of the two alliances depends on greater mutual understanding and the development of cooperation in the most varied fields—and first and foremost, of course, in that of disarmament—and therefore it depends also on the building of a common European home. We want to channel relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO along the path of "nonconfrontation," we intend to bring about a constructive dialogue in the political and military field that will become a factor of security in the continent. In this process a major impetus can come from the final elimination of the vestiges of the "cold war" and, first and foremost, from the rejection of the still-current stereotype of the "enemy." I believe it would be no bad thing if all of us in this regard were to be guided by the biblical principle: "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more."

Dialogue With Vatican at Higher Level

[L'UNITA] A meeting with the Pope is scheduled during the visit. This is an event of historic importance. What are the unresolved issues between the USSR and the Vatican today? Do you believe that the meeting could begin a full normalization of bilateral relations?

[Shevardnadze] Recently, our contacts with the Vatican have increased considerably. Fruitful cooperation in international forums within the framework of the more general European process is continuing. Exchanging messages and representatives has become a regular practice. Various topics are being discussed—the main international problems and, of course, issues connected with satisfying the religious demands of Soviet citizens of the Catholic faith. Among these problems there are a few which for the present can be deemed unresolved. As you know, the democratization processes in our country have also impinged on the religious sphere. For our part, further progress in this field depends on the imminent approval of the law on freedom of conscience and on religious organizations. In short, we are prepared to continue the dialogue with the Vatican. Gorbachev's meeting with Pope John Paul II will be a milestone in relations between the USSR and the Holy See; it will certainly take relations between the Soviet Union and the Vatican to a higher level.

[L'UNITA] The summit between Bush and Gorbachev will take place in the heart of the Mediterranean. Not far from the two leaders' meeting place is one of the most tragic hotbeds of tension and war still existing in the world. The Palestinian tragedy still seems to be without a solution, primarily because of Israel's intransigence. What can be done to bring the tragedy of the Middle East to a peaceful solution? Is joint action by the two major powers possible?

[Shevardnadze] Over the past few days, the Middle East has confirmed that it is a region fraught with dangers with unforeseeable consequences. I am referring to the barbarous and vile assassination of the Lebanese president. It is a severe blow for that country, which has experienced so much suffering, and it is a blow to the hopes of peace and a more peaceful future which had developed. Now Lebanon especially needs the international community's support. We must all show the utmost sense of responsibility and make the greatest possible joint effort to prevent a worsening of the Lebanese situation. I believe that there is international agreement on this. It is important to act vigorously in order to stabilize this situation; and the Soviet Union will do all that it can do. What, in our opinion, is the way to unblock the Arab-Israeli conflict? We start from the assumption that lasting peace in the Middle East will not be achieved unless the parties involved in the conflict consistently observe the principles of equality of rights, mutual security, noninterference in internal affairs, respect for sovereignty and political independence, and rejection of the use of force to resolve contentious issues. Today the first item on the agenda is the actual preparation of an international conference on the Middle East, especially since there is broad international agreement on the need for such an initiative. In the first place, there is the identity of views of the permanent members of the UN Security Council and of the EC; there is real readiness for a political settlement of the conflict on the part of the Arab nations involved; and there is a constructive and flexible stance on the part of the PLO. We believe that this preparatory stage should especially seek to diminish the tendency toward confrontation, to introduce factors creating confidence, and to create an atmosphere favorable to convening the conference and seeking mutually beneficial settlements. This presupposes a complex preparatory stage, open to various changes. Our approach is as follows: (1) To set in motion the Security Council machinery, without on that account dropping our proposal for examining the issue at a special council session at foreign minister level; (2) to intensify consultations among the permanent council members who, acting in direct contact with the parties involved in the conflict, should take on the role of the body preparing the conference; (3) to mobilize the peacemaking resources of the United Nations and its secretary general in order to ensure other forms of constructive involvement by the forces in favor of a settlement of the conflict. A special representative of the UN secretary general for the Middle East could be appointed, choosing a competent personality acceptable to all parties; (4) to begin bilateral and multilateral meetings and contacts between the parties directly concerned, and within this framework also a dialogue between Israel and the PLO. Certainly, the situation which has been created requires the most consistent commitment on the part of those who are able to facilitate a real solution to the Middle East problem. Of course, this presupposes the cooperation of the two major powers, which we deem quite possible. Our policy envisages the broadest possible cooperation with all countries; with the United States,

West Europe, and, obviously, with Italy, in order to create with respect to the Middle East an atmosphere capable of prompting the parties directly involved in the conflict to commit themselves seriously to resolving it. There is another thing which makes you think when you consider the Middle East. There lies the cradle of the three greatest present-day monotheistic religions—Christianity, Islam, and Judaism—and their undoubted potential for peacemaking could be harnessed to create the necessary agreement concerning the search for a solution for the Middle East.

Disarmament and Development Will Be Discussed at Malta

[L'UNITA] The past few years have been characterized by an extraordinary positive development in East-West relations. Disarmament and cooperation have taken great strides forward. However, very little seems to have changed in North-South relations. In fact the impoverishment and exploitation of the poorest countries have even worsened. Perhaps partly for this reason, there are some leaders of these countries who view the U.S.-USSR dialogue with suspicion. Is a joint East-West commitment to this major fundamental problem possible?

[Shevardnadze] It is not only possible but necessary. And the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, eliminating the danger of confrontation, is in particular destined to create favorable conditions for this commitment. However, how is it possible to devise an approach to the present-day world's problems without a serious and thorough analysis of the issue of development in all its aspects? On this matter we have also been given a mandate by the nonaligned countries' movement. As you will certainly know, Yugoslavia, in its capacity as chairman of the movement, has called on Gorbachev and Bush to pay proper attention to development matters at the summit. It is stressed in this appeal that, "without an economic detente," the detente process would be incomplete, unbalanced, and unstable. The Soviet side intends to raise in all its urgency at the summit the topic of joint action with the developing countries to surmount the economic and ecological crisis. This crisis represents for mankind a more real danger than nuclear weapons are today; and from this viewpoint the situation is worsening literally from day to day. Urgent and clear-cut decisions are therefore necessary. In the first place, means and resources are needed which could be released by disarmament and the reduction of military expenditures, but forms of economic cooperation between developed and developing countries, free from any discrimination, are no less necessary. The problem of the debt stifling many countries—in Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin American—can be relieved and then resolved only if the North removes all the obstacles to and constraints on the development of the southern countries' exports, and if the North generously makes available its technologies and provides assistance for training the Third World's skilled personnel. I believe that we are now in a position to tackle these issues with the United States in specific terms and at the practical level. The new character assumed by the dialogue between the two great powers makes this possible. However, it is high time not just that we examined these problems, which I do not hesitate to describe as extremely grave, but that we found solutions to this state of crisis. We are ready to act to this effect. The lessening of the confrontation between the USSR and the United States makes it possible also to raise in realistic terms the problem of the elimination of foreign military bases, and especially the foreign military presence in developing countries. It is necessary here to point out the possibility of converting military installations and using their equipment for civilian purposes without reducing the scale of assistance for the states on whose territories the bases are located. The improvement in East-West relations, the leap forward in the field of disarmament, and the beginning of a process of converting arms production to peaceful purposes open up enormous opportunities for cooperation for development. In this connection, I would like to emphasize the United Nations' role: The General Assembly pointed out the need to strengthen it in the resolution recently approved at the USSR's and the United States' proposal.

Idea of Socialism Still Attractive

[L'UNITA] One of the new elements of USSR European policy is the development of intensive interparty relations. A few weeks ago there was a meeting in Moscow between Willy Brandt and Gorbachev. What value does the CPSU attach to relations with the Socialist International? Do you think it possible in this new phase of international relations to overcome old divisions among forces of a socialist and progressive inspiration?

[Shevardnadze] Well, as soon as you used the word "divisions" I suddenly had pause for thought. In truth I am carrying on a long-standing reflection. I do not believe that any thinking communist can examine this problem outside the historical context, ignoring our common experience and the knowledge that we have now. Obviously I make no exceptions here. There was a time when even to think about this "division" seemed to me, to say the least, a pointless occupation. The history which we all share and which exerts a palpable influence on the present and the future rules out the use of the conditional: What would have happened if.... However, the actual present, what is happening now makes it imperative that we look back at the past. In other words, while continuing to reflect, I wonder whether all the possibilities for consolidating all the detachments of the "army of labor" on the basis of socialist ideals have been thoroughly exploited. And then I wonder what the world would look like now if it had been possible in the first place to overcome the schism in the movement of followers of the socialist idea... if, even though split into two currents, those people had nevertheless found a way to coexist without opposing one another and without taking stands against one another, if they had worked in the same direction or along parallel tracks. If that had happened, let us say, in the early thirties, perhaps we could have averted many things, including World War II. I expect that these arguments of mine reflect my own

personal experience, which persuades me that antagonisms are unproductive and not devoid of dangers to peace; that individuals, peoples, and social, political, and national movements, even if they are guided by opposite aims, have higher interests in common; and that it is rightly worthwhile at least mitigating their differences for the sake of those higher interests. That it is worth taking as the starting point what joins and unites them and not what divides them. Critical reconsideration of historical reality does not mean revision of the idea itself. Nothing can destroy the idea or empty it of meaning—not even the distortions of political practice caused by individual exponents in the past. For me, as for the majority of Soviet communists, the idea is still attractive, and everything that we are planning and doing is aimed at realizing it, rallying the people with its original force and clarity. The world is very different from what it was at the beginning of the century or on the eve of World War II. As the world changes, so our viewpoints change. It may be that conditions are now emerging that can stimulate communists and social democrats to rethink many things. This process is unlikely to develop without dialogue. We are the ones who are carrying it forward. The CPSU's relations with a number of social democratic and socialist parties and also with their international organization, the Socialist International, have assumed a regular character in recent years. Meetings between CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and Socialist International President Willy Brandt have now become customary. The range of problems that we debate with parties belonging to the Socialist International and with the International itself is broadening: disarmament, the economy, ecology, aid to developing countries, and so forth. And, even though some differences persist between us on a number of questions, it is possible today to say that we have to a certain degree overcome the old divisions among the forces of, as you said, "a socialist and progressive inspiration."

[L'UNITA] To what extent are the new Soviet foreign policy outlook and the new ideas that you have about the new world processes linked to the future of perestroyka?

[Shevardnadze] The new approach in foreign policy is inseparable from perestroyka and is an integral part of it. As long as perestroyka remains a vital force, what is called new political thinking will also be a vital force. The success of perestroyka means that the Soviet foreign policy orientations based on universal human interests and values and constructive collaboration for the solution of world problems are irreversible too.

Kobysh, Zhurkin Debate European Trends

PM0112105989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 5

["Dialogue" between Professor V. Zhurkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and IZVESTIYA political observer V. Kobysh: "European Horizons"—date and place not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The situation in Europe, where complex and, in many respects, contradictory processes are under way, occupies the increasing attention not only of professional politicians but also of the "man on the street." Professor V. Zhurkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and IZVESTIYA political observer V. Kobysh spoke about the prospects for European development.

[Zhurkin] Don't you think, Vitaliy Ivanovich, that no normal person will read any further if we don't begin our discussion with events in the GDR?

[Kobysh] And rightly so. However, everyone is well aware of the outline of events. People are worried about what will happen next, what to be glad about, and what to be afraid of. Nothing that concerns German affairs can leave Europeans cold—there is nothing inexplicable in this.

[Zhurkin] Yet we tried to pretend for many years—and we must admit this honestly—that problems do not exist. Now a word about the essence of the problem you have raised. I think that the main thing now is how rapidly, skillfully, and effectively the new GDR leadership brings reform policy into line with the processes developing spontaneously within the republic.

[Kobysh] In my opinion, that is not the question. The new GDR authorities have gotten down to business energetically and rapidly. In several days the composition of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Politburo was radically renewed, a new government was set up, and the borders were opened for people to move freely....

[Zhurkin] That is true. But I believe that it is still very hard at present to realistically assess how far the explosive processes have developed in GDR society. Will the dynamic reforms being implemented blend harmoniously with these internal processes or will they swamp the GDR structures that are being rapidly reformed.

These are all exceptionally important events for us.

The GDR is our ally and is a socialist state that is dear to us. We are linked with it by thousands of ties. The GDR's future is of top-priority importance for us. Of course, a process of economic and political reforms in the GDR, which would develop more or less harmoniously, including the full normalization of the problems of exchanges and trips, new levels of economic or other cooperation with the FRG (although it has developed quite well in recent years as it is), and an even more active role for each of the two German states in the international arena, would be normal and I believe civilized Europe is interested in this.

[Kobysh] But the situation seems alarming to many people, especially in connection with the fact that recent events in the GDR have once again stirred up in the

West the talk of German reunification that had nearly died down and some people are speaking even more bluntly about the GDR being swallowed up by the Federal Republic. This is also a reality and quite unpleasant reality at that. From my viewpoint, it is equally dangerous to both play down and overstate this threat. A cool head and accurate information are what is needed. Europe must not forget for a minute that this is a sensitive area.

[Zhurkin] I believe that the West's approach is very disparate, a mixture of everything. On the one hand, many political circles bound by their age-old, albeit quite abstract commitments deem it necessary to ostentatiously mention their support for reunification. All political forces in the FRG have voiced an opinion on this subject with their sights on next year's coming election.

At the same time the voice of responsible leading political and state forces who realize that something else is on the agenda today—normalization, stability, the broadening of all-European cooperation, and the creation of favorable conditions for the successful development of the reform process—is increasingly perceptible in Europe.

[Kobysh] I believe that this is not confined to Europe. U.S. leaders, who have said all the proper diplomatic things on this subject, nevertheless seem to be doing some hard thinking. The FRG is not such an easy partner for them. New riddles and alarming situations are arising on all sides.

[Zhurkin] To hear you, Vitaliy Ivanovich, it's just like the late thirties.... Let us return, however, to the present day. Major destabilizing events in the center of Europe may suspend or even break off the West European integration process. West Europe cannot stand that. But that is not the sole point. It is hard for Europe as a whole and for all of us to endure major destabilizing breakups. Of course, any rapid process of change brings with it elements of instability. But the international system can sustain them to a certain point. You cannot establish these limits by any international agreement. Moreover, it is alleged that our ideas and Western ideas of these limits were radically different 20 years ago. Today they are quite similar. The West has taken great steps to meet us halfway and we have done likewise. The process initiated by the CSCE and the new political thinking have also helped here. A very similar concept of stability has taken shape and must be safeguarded: Everyone without exception suffers when stability is disrupted.

[Kobysh] Yes, but the set of security problems is still the crux of this whole matter. We should determine a system of coordinates here: Where we are, where we would like to go, and how it will happen in reality.

Here we immediately come up against the problem of the two blocs—NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The problem of the confrontation between them has always been urgent, but has worsened in connection with the processes taking place in East Europe. A system of double standards has begun to operate actively within NATO.

First. Very important, long overdue processes are under way in Poland, Hungary, and now in the GDR, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. To be fair, it must be said that quite influential Western circles are following these processes sympathetically.

Second. Alas, something else has also been observed. Certain forces in the United States and West Europe have clearly conceived the idea of making capital out of the events that are taking place. First there was cautious and exploratory—and now insistent—talk of the possible (in some people's opinion) and even inevitable (others believe) withdrawal of these states from the Warsaw Pact. But a treaty is a treaty and in 1985 membership of the Warsaw Pact was extended and to simply withdraw from it arbitrarily not only involves disrupting the prevailing balance, but also violating international law.

Moreover. The following idea is being bandied about in the West, at a high level, moreover: Since no one threatens the Soviet Union and East European countries, the Warsaw Pact has outlived its usefulness and must be disbanded. Isn't it strange that the Warsaw Pact is to be disbanded, while NATO is still to exist?

[Zhurkin] Of course, the restructuring of security systems in Europe must, above all, be balanced—a transition from old to new forms—and coordinated to the maximum. Stability, stability, and more stability is the main demand of the day in Europe, that is the touchstone by which we must, above all, assess the changes taking place. Nothing must have a destabilizing effect, including the very dynamic process of creating a single internal market for the European community by the end of 1992, although this is a separate topic of special significance.

[Kobysh] If we aren't afraid of the West, and the West isn't afraid of us (both sides seem to have long since stopped thinking seriously about a surprise attack), what is the point of the existence of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Some Western leaders have put forward what I consider to be a strange idea. Let the blocs exist, acting as mechanisms to verify Soviet and U.S. fulfillment of the agreements on reductions in armed forces, the limitation of the arms race, and the elimination of weapons.

Isn't the verification mechanism costly and too cumbersome?

[Zhurkin] I like this idea. That could quite easily be one stage in the transformation and dismantling of the blocs. If we are being serious about this, stages are inevitable, there may even be many stages. In the past we frequently proposed eliminating NATO and the Warsaw Pact—or their military organizations to start with—but no one in the West took these appeals seriously, and I believe that there was a certain amount of diplomatic guile on our side. If the blocs' military mechanisms had been eliminated, NATO would have been left with a pile of political structures, while we would have had virtually nothing since the Political Consultative Committee and the Foreign Ministers' Committee meet only rarely.

Today we can talk in earnest about the blocs disappearing. But I am convinced that this will be a long and complex process. That is, the process of the politicization of the alliances will begin; or, to be more precise, the process of the politicization not of the alliances but of the Warsaw Pact, because NATO is incomparably more politicized: It has not only a parliamentary organ—the North Atlantic Assembly—but also a standing council, and committees to work with the public and with young people, and to forecast the future of Europe, and that's not all. Is it really a bad thing if powerful bodies are set up within the structure of the two blocs to verify arms and disarmament? They play a role in displacing military content from the blocs and servicemen are given new interesting work.

[Kobysh] I do not altogether agree with you. I believe, Vitaliy Vladimirovich, that NATO and the Warsaw Pact use the subject of verification of disarmament for one purpose—to perpetuate their existence.

[Zhurkin] Let us look at the problem from another angle. Are you certain that we ourselves have matured enough to abolish the blocs in the current international situation which is full of surprises? NATO hasn't, that's for sure.

[Kobysh] Allow me to raise an objection. I am convinced that neither our anxiety or, probably, any anxiety within NATO countries will be dispelled, I believe, least of all by these blocs. Rather the contrary, these gigantic alliances increase disquiet and impede the solution of military, political, and even economic problems, not to mention the military expenditure involved in maintaining them. Obviously, we must think about some kind of universal all-European formation rather than about blocs.

[Zhurkin] Are you referring to our idea of the "common European home," the West German idea of a peaceful European system to which the European community has taken a fancy, U.S. ideas of a united free Europe, all this together, or something else?

[Kobysh] You put me in a difficult position by assuming that I am prepared to exchange our native national idea of a "common European home" for the options set out by the West.

Let us begin by saying, however, that, having borrowed the rational kernel from them, I would not reject these options out of hand. As for the "common European home," who would dare—no, not dare—who would be stupid enough to raise any objection to it? It is a splendid idea in general. But I think that it was first put forward as a metaphor. People in our country have transformed the metaphor into a blueprint where everything is planned down to the finest details. I believe that there is a large element of exaggeration and anticipation here.

[Zhurkin] First, no blueprint exists as yet, although the whole world is demanding that we submit one as a matter of urgency. Second, I do not think that we should think about future European structural development. Third, a real process of building this future is under way in Europe. That is the CSCE process. The rudiments of an emergent all-European structure are gradually beginning to be perceptible there. I believe that the idea of a "common European home" is good because it is not extremely concretized. It enshrines a concept, an overall program, without particular details, and the possibility of development, especially since the "home" must be planned and built by everyone rather than us alone. This idea may take the form of a new phase of the CSCE, say, after the "Helsinki-2" conference in 1992. Something fundamentally new may emerge, although I personally support the first option.

Understandably, having put forward the idea of a "common European home," thus winning deserved prestige, we cannot forget that our part of this home" has still not been developed. That is why the idea of a "home" is another argument in favor of speeding up perestroyka.

[Kobysh] I wholeheartedly applaud your words to the effect that the idea of a "home" is another argument in favor of perestroyka. Certainly, a "common European home" would not only speed up perestroyka, but also it would by no means impede the resolution of the acute problems which are currently worrying our people—economic, interethnic, and, who knows, possibly even moral problems to some extent.

[Zhurkin] The "common European home" could be a base for the implementation of our ideas about the primacy of universal human values over class values. This idea is very hard to realize. Because any strong class ideology claims to be the universal human ideology. Let us recall our own example. Our history began with the belief in worldwide revolution. This did not happen. Then there was the slogan that we would rapidly build a model in our country and the whole world would move in this direction in orderly ranks. We have also hitherto missed the mark here.

Western class ideology continues to claim to be the universal human ideology and claims that the whole world will ultimately restructure itself more or less uniformly on the Western model. The idea of the primacy of universal human values—synthesized and at the same time full of diversity—does not have that many supporters in the West. If you like, our theses regarding the primacy of universal human values represents a moral challenge to the West. The "common European home" could be a splendid place for dialogue on this topic, the quest for similarity between various branches of a united world civilization—the civilization of the next century founded on unprecedented scientific-technical progress.

[Kobysh] So, there convergence after all, and only the word itself which has been anathematized is not uttered?

[Zhurkin] It is not a matter of words. I believe that people who criticize convergence without grasping the essence of this idea are following the familiar path of cliched abuse. At one time they swore at Weismannism,

Morganism, cybernetics, and genetics.... There were countless numbers of these cliches in social sciences.

[Kobysh] That is certainly how they proceeded from one "victory" to the next "victory" over each successive foe. However, to be serious, they paid virtually no attention at all to social sciences: What is the good of them, it was said, when the country needs oil, steel, and coal.

[Zhurkin] As for ways of developing civilization, different societies have different categories—the market, regulation of the market. Naturally, every system injects its own characteristics into the diversity of the world, and socialism, which is being renewed in the course of perestroyka, will display its uniqueness.

[Kobysh] All this once again prompts the thought of why exactly the two sides needed to create monstrous military machines to oppose one another, which became to a certain extent self-charging mechanisms. It has taken us almost 50 years to have the wisdom to realize that this is ridiculous and suicidal. This threat of suicide looming over mankind also seems to have forced many people—but not everyone as yet—to wrack their brains and think: Can something still be done or is it already the end?

[Zhurkin] All the same, the situation here seems to me to be comparatively favorable: In our language, the idea is increasingly becoming a material force. We and the West have boldly advanced to meet one another halfway on the highly important and difficult base of conventional arms reductions. I sincerely believe that the first agreement will be secured next year. This means that talk will turn to nuclear weapons reductions in Europe. We must seek a compromise at this point in history between our idea of a nuclear-free world and a nuclear-free Europe and the Western concept of deterrence.

We will probably have to think about quite a long period of mutual—including nuclear—deterrence based on a very small minimum quantity of nuclear arms on both sides, well, say, 100-200 nuclear munitions.

[Kobysh] I seem to be some kind of incorrigible pessimist, while you are an optimist. It is good that optimists have not yet become extinct. But I want to say something else. I get the impression that people become accustomed not only to one another and to beloved animals or objects, but also to words which conceal ingrained stereotypes. You have said a great deal about "deterrence" now. This expression arose during the worst cold war years and it probably had its own considerable meaning then. But what kind of "deterrence" can be at issue today?

[Zhurkin] By no means everyone in the West believes in the success of our perestroyka and deems it irreversible. They still have a considerable number of waverers and doubters who say: Won't everything be reversed, then a new cold war and, maybe, a graduation to a hot war. I am not trying to justify them. I am trying to understand their motives. You cannot persuade people by words alone. They are convinced by action. There is more and more of this action. This is a process. We cannot tell now how long it will last, but I believe that we will still have to encounter mistrust toward us and even fear of the "Soviet threat." Of course, tremendous changes have taken place in the world around us and in mankind's consciousness—under the influence of our perestroyka above all. The number of people who believe that a period of peace has finally set in in the history of mankind is rapidly increasing. In Sweden, for instance, some scientists from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute are compiling a plan for all-European armed forces for the 21st century, including contingents from all CSCE member countries. The major Western powers, although not all of them, are beginning work on reducing military potentials.

Now take our side.. Can we say with 100-percent certainty that no one wants to exploit the difficulties of our transitional period—and it will last for more than a year or two? In this situation some minimum quantity of nuclear weapons will give us a feeling of confidence—not ad infinitum, not forever, but for some time. I believe that these weapons will be useful for our status as a great power during the transitional period.

Everything I have said not only does not contravene our unilateral reductions but requires us, perhaps, to go even further: We must not forget that even after the current cuts our armed forces will still be the largest in the world. Even after the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan and the reduction of our forces in East Europe and Mongolia we still have as many soldiers and officers abroad as the United States.

The last calculation was effected using Western data. But what can you do? Our own data is a scarce commodity. We probably publish more of this data today than we did in the past. And probably less than other civilized countries do.

[Kobysh] You get the impression that stereotypes have not bypassed such a serious concept as a "state's might." You were speaking about armed forces and arms. Are we not thinking in old categories here: More soldiers equal a stronger country? The following expression has become popular: "Japan won World War III," without firing a single shot. It won by economic might, supreme technology, good brains, which enabled it to look to the future, and of course, most persistent, outright furious work. Returning to Europe, I could say that not only the FRG and France but also relatively small Sweden and Finland have also become powerful states. That is something to think about.

[Zhurkin] Aren't we countering some stereotypes with others. I think a state's might is determined by the state of human rights, shelves in stores, hospitals, schools, and universities, in short by everything that creates a calm, self-confident, and dynamic citizen. I am leading up to the point that the might of a state is a multifaceted concept, moreover the correlation between the facets is changing in the process of the development of human civilization. Returning to the same Europe I want to say

that one of the facets of this might is the ability to live among other peoples, in short to be a worthy inhabitant and worker in the "common European home." Our perestroyka is also targeted toward this.

Zamyatin Views World Scene on Eve of Malta Meeting

PM0112173089 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 1 Dec 89 p 11

[Interview with USSR London Ambassador Leonid Zamyatin by Robert Harvey: "Rival Military Blocs May Be Stabilizers, Says Soviet Envoy"]

[Excerpts] On the eve of the Malta summit and in the wake of upheaval in Eastern Europe, Mr Leonid Zamyatin, Soviet Ambassador to Britain and a member of the Communist Party's Central Committee, spoke to Robert Harvey.

[Harvey] How do you see the changes in Eastern Europe affecting conventional arms talks? Are you optimistic about progress?

[Zamyatin] Yes, I'm certainly optimistic about the prospects for the Vienna conventional arms talks and I'm sure one of the items on the agenda for the meeting between President Gorbachev and President Bush will be seeking means to speed up the negotiations so that the treaty can be in the time frame mentioned by President Bush.

The negotiations are proceeding well and I think they will lead to a substantial reduction of the tensions and confrontations which exist in Europe today...There should be no other unilateral reductions. They should be agreed reductions. [passage omitted]

[Harvey] Mr Gorbachev has made clear that he is prepared to accept the right of Eastern European countries to go the way they choose. Does this mean that there is no possibility of Soviet intervention in the internal policies of any Eastern European country even if it rejects the leading role of the Communist Party?

[Zamyatin] I am convinced that the internal processes which are going on in Eastern European countries should be resolved without any interference from our side.

You have just quoted Mr Gorbachev to me saying they have complete freedom of choice. I feel that the true nature of the policies of the Soviet Union which assumes no interference and true freedom of all East European nations to resolve their own fates and policies.

But I also view the Eastern European situation in a wider context: it is not only that there should be no Soviet interference into the affairs of these countries but no interference from the outside at all. It may well happen that some other parties apart from the Soviet Union may wish to interfere in the processes; this is unacceptable.

As for the leading role of the party, the example of Poland demonstrated that, for instance, the Polish United Workers' Party has failed to secure the power, has failed to secure the support of the people, and another force has come to power.

Our reaction to the developments in Poland does support the fact that we view these nations as free to make their choice.

[Harvey] Might the leading role of the party ever be challenged or revised in the Soviet Union?

[Zamyatin] The issue of the leading role of the Communist Party does not exist as such in the Soviet Union of today. The Soviet people accept the leading role of the Communist Party.

Yes, there does exist the issue of a more pluralistic approach to the discussion and it is espoused in party policies. The people do not pose a question of creating parallel political parties or parallel political organisations...

The main emphasis in Gorbachev's political reform is on the development of true pluralism of opinions and in the debate of the country. The best example of the democratisation of our society is the way our Supreme Soviet, or parliament, operates now. It does so in a very open and free manner and everybody can see it on the TV screens.

[Harvey] The decision to open the Berlin Wall is said to have been taken with Mr Gorbachev's support and approval. Does it signify the end of the Cold War and the end to confrontation between the two blocs in Central Europe?

[Zamyatin] The development of the reform process in the countries of Eastern Europe does put on the agenda very formally the need for Europe to unite in a new political atmosphere, in a new political, ideological and spiritual unity.

The Berlin Wall which divided the two Berlins is more of a symbol than anything else. I think the genuine process goes much deeper than that because the destruction of the wall has provided the opportunity for the people of East and West to make more mutual contact.

I would like to emphasise that the decision to eliminate the wall was taken by the government of the German Democratic Republic. Yes, perhaps under the influence of the reform process within the Soviet Union; but I won't accept the direct link; I won't accept that it was demolished or eliminated under a direct command or instruction from the Soviet Union.

We welcomed it. We take a positive attitude towards what is happening in the GDR. [passage omitted]

[Harvey] All sides accept that there should be no change to the post-war boundaries, but nevertheless one could see a momentum building up for the reunification of Germany if elections are held in the East. How does the Soviet Union view this possibility?

[Zamyatin] As from today, German reunification is not on the agenda of international negotiations. First of all, the

reunification of Germany would require the redrawing of the post-war boundaries in Europe. And in the Helsinki Declaration you will find that the viability of post-war European borders has been accepted by all signatories.

Redrawing borders in any part of the world is always a very complex process and it always has some negative effects. Take for example the history of the Versailles Treaty after the First World War. After it was signed the process of redrafting was started and ultimately led to the Second World War.

I don't think we are interested in creating a situation like that in today's Europe... We need stabilised post-war borders in Europe, but I don't think in today's situation we can seriously discuss the reunification of Germany.

[Harvey] Two areas of ideological difference are Afghanistan and Central America, which the U.S. Secretary of State has said is the single biggest obstacle to improved relations with Russia. How do you view these two problems?

[Zamyatin] About Afghanistan. The first part of the solution of the issue which depended primarily on the Soviet government has been completed. We were obliged under the Geneva accord to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan, and that's exactly what we did.

For a long time now we have not been able to accomplish the second part of the Geneva accord, that is, to bring national reconciliation to Afghanistan, to create a government of reconciliation. In our view the main obstacles lies with the position of the American and British governments. They supported only one side, the Peshawar Seven, militarily and politically.

But this is not the basis for a solution of this problem. The country has a legitimate government headed by President Najibullah. They say the first condition is that he should step down. He said himself he is going to step down when a united government is established.

We even told the Americans and the British that we don't mind if some temporary head of some Shura, or round table, was headed by the former King Zahir Shah. Even this idea was not accepted by the West.

This policy has handicapped a political solution to establish a neutral democratic country with free elections but certainly taking into acccount the interest of the different powers in Afghanistan.

We are ready to stop the supply of Soviet weapons to those that are friendly with us when the Americans have simultaneously stoped their supply of weapons to the Mujahidin. [passage omitted]

United States & Canada

Bush, Gorbachev Meet in Malta 2-3 Dec

Akhromeyev Previews Meeting

AU0112143989 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian 29 Nov 89 p 4

[Interview with USSR Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev by Vladimir Ostrovskiy, "NOVOSTI parliamentary observer,": "Contradictions Can Be Surmounted,"—in Moscow on 28 November]

[Text] Moscow, 28 November—The workday of USSR Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev is planned to the minute. This is understandable. His exceptional workload is a result not only of his tasks as a people's deputy, which has especially increased now during the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, but also a result of his official duties—he is an adviser to Mikhail Gorbachev.

[Ostrovskiy] Could you describe briefly the basic contradictions between the two sides in the sphere of disarmament on the eve of the summit meeting near Malta?

[Akhromeyev] I think that there are grounds for optimism. More than half of the road has been travelled at the Geneva talks on reducing strategic offensive weapons. Naturally, there are also serious contradictions which must be resolved. The fact that there still is no agreement on binding the future treaty on reducing strategic strike weapons to the 1972 ABM Treaty, is one of the contradictions. In addition, we still have not reached an agreement on air- and sea-based cruise missiles.

Our partners also express certain dissatisfaction with the talks. Thus, the Americans think that the issue of the USSR "SS-18" heavy missiles has not been fully resolved. For our part, we think that we have proposed to the Americans everything necessary for reaching an agreement on this kind of weapon. There also are problems regarding verification, as well as regarding the specification of certain judicial issues, which must be resolved before the ratification of those documents becomes possible.

[Ostrovskiy] What do you think must be done in order to achieve this?

[Akhromeyev] We need agreements and mutual concessions on all issues of fundamental importance. Naturally, now it is difficult to forecast the distant future. However, I think that the forthcoming meeting of the two leaders in the Mediterranean, and their meeting in Washington next year, will contribute to resolving most of the existing questions.

IZVESTIYA Previews Meeting

PM0112173589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Special correspondent S. Kondrashov dispatch: "Malta, 1 December"]

[Excerpt] Marsaxlokk Bay, Malta—Recent events and achievements are so fresh in everyone's memory that there is no need to describe them in detail now, as we await the dialogue on the two cruisers in Marsaxlokk Bay in Malta. It is obvious that the situation in our foreign policy is better than in our domestic policy. Confidence in perestroyka is still rising abroad, whereas at home it is diminishing under the burden of all kind of shortages.

Foreign policy is already practically benefiting our domestic policy since the calmer atmosphere in the world makes it possible for us to cut military expenditures. In recent weeks the United States and the Pentagon have begun to shift. Taking the cuts in the USSR defense budget seriously, the U.S. secretary of defense has given orders for plans to be drawn up to cut expenditures by $180 billion over the next 5 years. The Administration has been forced to hurry. Otherwise, experts believe, the U.S. Congress could make even deeper inroads into the Pentagon's pockets. This is in keeping with the new sentiments prevailing in society.

Experience indicates that Moscow is more willing to hold summits. Washington views them with greater caution, wary of dirty tricks on the part of Moscow and also possible criticism from opponents at home. However, this time the evidence of constructive shifts in Soviet policy is so patent, and the pace of perestroyka processes in the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe so swift, that the highly cautious President Bush has decided to make haste, seizing the initiative himself. True, he has not cast off caution. At a recent press conference he announced that he had sent M.S. Gorbachev a message stating that he does not intend to conclude any arms reduction agreements in Malta; moreover, the president stressed, it was a hand-written message in case the Soviet leader might think this was the work of the Washington bureaucracy acting without the President's knowledge.

In actual fact, agreements are not likely to be signed. However, judging by appearances, a frank conversation will take place on a wide range of questions, including disarmament prospects and regional conflicts. It would be a good thing if a spirit of mutual security reigned during the talks aboard the two cruisers, which are of spartan simplicity. I believe that it will. Perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the radical transformations in a number of socialist countries in Eastern Europe will no doubt be touched upon. Soviet-U.S. relations will also be viewed in this light. It must be a clear light, to ensure that the future of Europe and the world is unambiguous as regards the stances of the two powers....

President Bush will spend approximately 7 hours on the Soviet cruiser "Slava" on 2 December. Judging by the program, the two leaders will spend 2 hours in one-on-one talks, in addition to two meetings on a larger scale and a luncheon given by M.S. Gorbachev. In the evening there will be a dinner on behalf of the U.S. President on the cruiser "Belknap." On 3 December M.S. Gorbachev and the Soviet delegation will spend 4 hours on the U.S. vessel. Subsequently two separate press conferences will be held. The period of expectation will over, the time of summing up the results will have come.

[Writing on page 4 of Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 December, First Edition, the paper's special correspondent G. Vasilyev ends his Malta scene-setting dispatch entitled "In the Peaceful Roadstead" as follows:

"It is well known that politicians taking part in any major talks do not like heightened expectations. Nonetheless, people are expecting positive results from the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush. Above all they expect the development and deepening of the constructive trends which have strengthened in Soviet-U.S. relations in recent years and which are influencing the political climate on our planet so favorably."]

U.S. Perceptions on Eve Viewed

PM0212232589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by APN correspondent Edgar Cheporov for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "An Opportunity Not To Be Missed: What Americans Think About Relations With the USSR"]

[Text] New York—On the eve of each significant event the public opinion polls here are particularly active. America studies itself, politicians adjust their assessments and measure them against the opinions of those whose votes they will have to compete for in the elections to Congress and the White House. What do ordinary Americans think about relations with the USSR? Is the cold war over? On the eve of the meeting in the Mediterranean between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush the topicality of these questions is more obvious than ever.

Judging by a poll conducted by THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC-TV, 58 percent of Americans think that the cold war is coming to an end and that this difficult period in the history of USSR-U.S. relations is drawing to a close.

Washington's present leaders need to take account of such trends in Americans' feelings and prepare their answers to them. This is no easy process for the administration and therefore it has been and continues to be accused of tardiness and an inability and unwillingness to take a fresh look at the world and relations with the USSR. Such criticism cannot be ignored. The press cites the comment by U.S. Secretary of State Baker that if the administration "proves incapable of surmounting its instinctive skepticism toward Moscow" the Republicans face inevitable disaster at the next presidential elections. Furthermore, the secretary of state believes, the allies will reject U.S. leadership and Bush will go down in history as the man who failed to seize the opportunity to end the cold war.

Nor can one underestimate the fact that it is precisely on the eve of the summit that Washington has for the first time abandoned the traditional thesis that the Russians are continuing to increase defense spending and for the first time has confirmed that Moscow is keeping its word and is cutting its military budget. In response the Pentagon has announced its intention to cut its budget by $10 billion in 1991 and reduce it by $180 billion over 5 years beginning in 1992. "The world is changing," U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney said when explaining this move, "and conflict between the United States and the USSR is now less likely than at any time since the end of World War II.

The administration's turnaround in its attitude to military spending was so significant and abrupt that the military concerns' shares fell immediately on the stock market. It is also interesting that THE NEW YORK TIMES, which always opposed inflated military budgets, did not hide the fact that it was astonished by the Pentagon's bold step.

As he sets off for the meeting in the Mediterranean Bush is hearing advice, parting words, and predictions everywhere. I shall cite what I think are the most typical. Senator Jesse Helms: "I hope that no fundamental decisions will be taken at the meeting." Senator Lloyd Bentsen: "This informal meeting may create an atmosphere conducive to progress in several directions, including trade in addition to arms control."

Finally there is one more message to the U.S. President as he sets off. I have talked some with Americans about the forthcoming summit meeting. They are not all well versed on the question of the number of warheads on Soviet and U.S. missiles, nor do they all know which of our two countries spends more on military needs and which less. But the majority of them agree that the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States can be called successful only if it becomes a step on the path of mutual understanding and reduces military rivalry. That is, if it strikes a blow against the cold war. "We are living in an era of extraordinary changes, much risk, and great possibilities," I read in USA TODAY recently. "A time when the two most powerful men in the world can, by working together, achieve historic results. These results may be beneficial to the USSR. But despite the dogma of the cold war they will be beneficial to us, too."

TASS Predicts 'Major Headway'

LD0112162489 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—By a TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The unofficial Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, which starts off Malta on Saturday, is regarded in the Soviet Union as proof that positive changes in relations between the two countries are acquiring a new quality.

It is expected that during the two-day talks on board the Soviet and American cruisers Slava and Belknap, Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush will hold a general discussion of the more acute world problems, bilateral relations and trade and economic interaction between the USSR and the U.S.

Both sides insist that the agenda of the meeting will be broad and practically unlimited. There are good reasons to believe that arms control will be one of the central issues on the agenda.

Although one can hardly expect any formal agreements on specific problems to be signed, evidence suggests that major headway will be made in promoting mutual understanding and coordinating the remaining outstanding issues. The conversations between the two leaders may lead to the elaboration of some general formulas, which could be later discussed and finalised by negotiators.

Soviet diplomatic circles entertain certain hopes that the shipborne meeting off Malta would help start a bilateral dialogue on naval armaments, which have been so far left beyond the bounds of the disarmament dialogue. It is impossible to reduce arms in one area while leaving aside other areas, because such an approach may have a destabilising effect. However the American side holds a different view.

There is no doubt that Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush will pay much attention to the dynamic processes of change in East European countries. For its part the Soviet Union has pointed out on more than one occasion that events there are the internal affair of the people of these countries.

Judging by the statements of a high-ranking Western diplomat on the eve of the meeting, the U.S. does not want these changes to lead to a split in the Warsaw Treaty organisation and have a negative effect on the security of the Soviet Union and its allies.

There seems to be certain understanding on the so-called German issue. The sides hold the view that this problem is not on the agenda now. Its solution, if it is required in future, should be sought in building a general system of security on the continent which would guarantee the security of all those involved in the European process.

Conflicts in other regions of the world—Central America, Afghanistan and the Middle East—will also concern the two leaders.

The Soviet Union hopes that discussions between the leaders of the two countries will mark an important stage in preparing official large-scale talks at summit level, due to be held in the U.S. next year.

Value of Contacts Stressed

PM0212233989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 pp 1,3

[Special correspondent A. Drozdov article: "Cruisers Under a Sail of Hope"]

[Text] Valletta—The press sometimes likes to play with words. This time, too, in anticipation of the Soviet-U.S. summit, it has made liberal use of the headline "From Yalta to Malta." But it was not a great success, even though in the English the words "Yalta" and "Malta" rhyme very pleasingly. Nor is it to do with the fact that politics is far removed from poetry.

Whereas in Yalta the world's leaders then were crouched over the map of Europe trying to arrange the border between the two systems, gritting their teeth and politely hiding their furious dislike for each other, in Malta perhaps an attempt will be made to formulate the new principles of East-West relations, thus for the world as a whole. Of course, some specific questions will be settled in the Maltese capital, Valletta, but the most important thing will be the exchange of ideas on a very simple theme: How are we to live in the future?

When they have found common approaches to an answer, Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush will be able to lay the foundations of a political philosophy for the future. It is gratifying that neither leader, as far as their statements on the eve of the meeting show, will be seeking to increase the number of specific accords. The practice of past years shows that personal meetings have been impoverished by an orientation toward the careful preparation of talks so as to produce a final document, even if not a very substantial one, however long it takes. But it is precisely personal contacts not bound up with conventions and marked by such pleasing improvisation that our leaders and our countries need right now. And they aren't the only ones.

On the eve of the meeting George Bush made a statement on the need to leave the era of deterrence behind and end the cold war.

I believe that the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy and the Vatican will convince many people both in the West and East that freedom of choice has firmly entered into the system of our foreign policy principles. The new thinking also includes recognition of and respect for religious values. Religion has by no means exhausted its spiritual potential.

On the eve of his arrival in Valletta the U.S. President tried to play on the Maltese theme.

He stated that the ships of ruined empires lie in the waters that wash Valletta's fortress. What, in George Bush's opinion, does this fact show? That success lies not in imperial policy but in movement along the path of freedom and democracy. But there is no need to convince us of that, and even less need to impose conditions when calling for freedom and democracy. In recent years

the USSR has done nothing but demonstrate its readiness for deideologization, that is, for the rejection of prejudices and delusions. Today, too, we advocate a rivalry between the two systems—no longer for the purpose of eliminating the other system but in the interests of ensuring a peaceful life for all and improving the quality of that life. If Bush has five conditions, we, it seems to me, have one: Recognition of the right of the different sociopolitical systems to exist. If the communist concept is unacceptable to the United States, far from everything in the Western model of democracy suits us. The Soviet Union's proposal is to reconsider the existing ideological directives in the light of the new political realities because historic community must be achieved despite the ideological division.

If our partners in the talks do not understand that, then we shall go on doing the most futile and tedious job on earth—counting up each other's nuclear warheads.

In recent weeks the situation has changed abruptly in countries allied to the Soviet Union: Hungary, Poland, the GDR, the CSSR, and Bulgaria. There is no doubt that the situation in East Europe will overshadow the disarmament problems which traditionally dominate the agenda of talks between the USSR and the United States. Because of the persistent efforts of Mikhail Gorbachev—and this is not the flattery of a professional propagandist—the Soviet Union has undertaken steps, including unilateral ones (the withdrawal of 500,000 Soviet military servicemen from East Europe), which have led to the easing of confrontation between the two military blocs, the Warsaw Pact and NATO. This has helped the discussion of the problems of nuclear disarmament to proceed, I think, in a calmer and more businesslike manner. But the situation itself in East Europe, which of course is closely bound up with disarmament questions, has changed and is changing so quickly that the United States and, to a lesser extent, the USSR, too, find themselves facing new political realities.

Disarmament represents another major range of problems at the Malta meeting. It is inevitable that the meeting in Malta will bring up for discussion the problem of the U.S. and USSR military presence in the Mediterranean. In Rome Mikhail Gorbachev noted the expediency of discussing the problem of removing nuclear weapons from this region.

By tradition the U.S. President will raise the problem of human rights in the Soviet Union. This time, however, as Western political observers are noting, he will not limit himself to talking about the problem of emigration from our country. Recently the U.S. side has also been including in the human rights concept the Soviet leadership's attitude toward the noncommunist social and political movements which have emerged and continue to emerge in the Soviet Union. It is common knowledge that the U.S. Administration is not indifferent to problems of interethnic relations in the USSR, sometimes overstepping the mark between conventional political appraisal and interference in our internal affairs. Consequently, the discussion on those problems will be complex.

Judging by the stream of reports reaching Valletta, the Soviet-U.S. summit will not spring any surprises. But who knows? Personal contacts in a calm, creative atmosphere sometimes strike vivid sparks of political insight—to universal amazement.

TASS Views 'Yalta Phantom'

LD0112153889 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Valletta December 1 TASS—By TASS special correspondent: The last preparations are being made in Malta for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting that will be held this weekend. The Soviet missile cruiser Slava and the American cruiser Belknap that will co-host Presidents George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev are already anchored in the bay off Malta's capital. Hundreds of correspondents, who have come here to cover the summit, are discussing its possible outcome.

It has taken the Bush administration almost a year to agree to meet the Soviet president. The constructive development of relations between the superpowers and the Soviet Union—initiated construction of a common European home do not suit everyone. Clearly some of these forces are to blame for the fact that some Western newspapes have begun to mention a "Yalta phantom."

The emergence of this phantom is connected with the profound changes in Eastern Europe. The whole world is closely following the democratisation, the renewal of socialism and the implementation of peoples' right to a free choice in that region. Naturally, in European conditions this right has its own special features connected with World War II and its outcome. The notion of "Yalta" has long been interpreted in different ways. For the Soviet Union the Yalta conference was a major historic event that laid the foundation of the world's postwar structure. The emergence of the phantom of a new Yalta along with the phantonm of German reunification did not evoke much enthusiasm in the West, including the United States.

The U.S. NEWSWEEK magazine wrote recently that the U.S. had always lied to itself and the world that it wanted a peaceful re- unification of the two German states some time in the future, confident that this would never happen.

The majority of people understand the realities of present-day Europe. The most important of them is the existence of two German states, this fact being recognised by the international community. [sentence as received]

This issue was discussed at a recent European Community summit in Paris. Its participants concluded that it was untimely to raise the issue of postwar borders in Europe.

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said the borders should remain as they are. Bush in a recent interview said, referring to the Malta summit, that "we're not going to have a Yalta." He added that "it's not the role of the United States of America and the Soviet Union to divide up things or alter borders."

At the summit, the Soviet side intends to build on its cooperation with the U.S. in security, human rights and the economy and to seek new positive changes. Observers say there are still obstacles to this goal. Some people claim that the changes in Europe were prompted by the position of strength policy, that the developments are oriented to 'Western values' and that a 'strong West' guarantees the irreversibility of these developments. [quotation marks as received] However, these changes have been brought to Europe by new political thinking and a new attitude to the role of force in international affairs, analysts point out.

It is the feeling of greater security, evoked by new political thinking, by arms cuts and confidence-building measures, that has made possible the political and economic reforms. The forthcoming talks have been announced to be interim and informal, while a full-scale Soviet-U.S. summit will be held in late spring or early summer in the United States.

Gorbachev Arrives in Malta, Makes Statement

LD0212012989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0000 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Excerpt] The Soviet-U.S. working summit begins off the shores of Malta today. Here is Andrey Ptashnikov, our special correspondent in Valletta, the Maltese capital.

[Ptsahnikov] The first working meeting between Comrade Gorbachev and President Bush, and also between the delegations' members, is set for 1000 Maltese time. This will be 1200 Moscow time [0900 GMT]. As is being properly noted here by many journalists, Comrade Gorbachev and his entourage have had very little time for rest. Indeed, the Soviet delegation arrived in Valletta from Italy late at night. There was a formal welcoming ceremony at the airport. The Maltese president and prime minister took part. Mikhail Sergeyevich made a brief statement.

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Esteemed Mr President, esteemed Mr Prime Minister, ladies and gentlemen, comrades, I would like to thank the president, the government, and the people of Malta for their hospitality. I would again like to express my thanks for the quick decision in response to our joint request—I refer to the request from President Bush and myself—to be granted the possibility of meeting here, off the shores of Malta.

Although we are meeting aboard ships, I would like to assure you that our discussion will be, I am certain, about a better world, and about how to move as rapidly as possible from the present phase in the development of international relations to a more stable peace on all continents. I attach great significance to this meeting. We hope to have major discussions, without distractions and without losing time on formalities, on matters that concern our peoples—I have in mind the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States—and also the peoples of all countries. President Bush and I agreed on this meeting before the official visit to the United States by the Soviet leader. We believe the times are such, and that events are developing in such a way, that greater dynamism is needed in our relations, our links, and our dialogue. That is the reason we are here. I would like to say again...to express words of gratitude to you and to the entire Maltese people. I hope we will take advantage of your hospitality in the best possible way. Thank you. [end recording]

[Ptashnikov] In his reply speech, Maltese President Vincent Tabone welcomed Comrade Gorbachev on behalf of the people and government of the country. He also expressed his assurance that the Maltese side would do everything necessary to ensure that the Soviet-U.S. summit is successful.

At the end of the airport welcoming ceremony, Mikhail Sergeyevich left for the Maltese prime minister's residence, where he had a brief conversation with the country's leaders. It can thus be said that one summit meeting, the Soviet-Maltese summit, has already taken place. [passage omitted]

Meets Maltese Premier

LD0212094689 Moscow TASS in English 0931 GMT 2 Dec 89

["Communique on Gorbachev's Meeting With Maltese Premier"—TASS headline]

[Text] Valletta December 2 TASS—On his arrival in Malta on Friday, Mikhail Gorbachev met Maltese prime Minister Edward Fenech Adami. A communique was released on the results of the meeting.

Gorbachev expressed to the Maltese Government sincere gratitude for the possibility to hold a Soviet-U.S. summit off Malta, the document says. It is regarded as readiness of neutral non-aligned Malta to use its prestige for the promotion of peace and international cooperation.

In a friendly atmosphere the heads of the two countries noted with satisfaction the closeness of attitudes towards security issues and a search for answers to the challenges of time through the joint efforts of states, both large and small.

The sides reaffirmed their commitment to the principles of the U.N. Charter and the Helsinki Final Act, other agreements in the CSCE framework, and spoke out in favour of using the entire positive potential to extend international and stepping up European dialogue in line with the tempestuous course of events.

The two leaders stressed the need to build up constructive efforts to tackle the Mediterranean problems, and to

promote broad interaction of all states in this vital region of the world. They gave a positive assessment to the state of Soviet-Maltese relations and favoured their further perfection and development in the political, economic, cultural and other fields.

Bush Arrives on Board 'Belknap'

LD0112155289 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Valletta December 1 TASS—After a brief meeting with the Maltese Prime Minister Edward Fenech Adami and visiting the Forrestal cruiser, U.S. President George Bush arrived on board the Belknap cruiser, the flagship of the U.S. Six Fleet, which will serve as the president's home in the Mediterranean during an unofficial Soviet-American summit off Malta.

President Bush, who, under the Constitution, is commander-in- chief of the U.S. Armed Forces, and officials accompanying him, were welcomed on board the Belknap by commander of the missile cruiser Captain First Class John Siegler.

The U.S. CNN network reports that after inspecting the cruiser and holding conference with his advisers, the President intends to have a good rest after a transatlantic flight prior to the meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev fixed for Saturday.

Gorbachev-Bush Talks Begin 2 Dec

LD0212115589 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

An intermediate unofficial meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush began on Malta today. It is being held aboard the Soviet cruiseliner Maksim Gorkiy. Due to bad weather plans to hold it on board the Soviet missile cruiser Slava, anchored off Malta, were scrapped.

The world has started to move towards a new epoch that will be dominated by universal human values, comprehensive and mutual security. This idea, expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev on the eve of the summit, reflects the aspiration of people not only in Europe but throughout the world. The Soviet president said on his arrival in Malta that he and the U.S. President would discuss paths leading to a better world and how to move from the current stage of relations to stronger peace on all continents as soon as possible.

Events are developing so tempestuously that a greater dynamism is needed in Soviet-U.S. relations, contacts and dialogue. Therefore, Gorbachev said, there would be serious talk about those matters that are uppermost in the minds of people in the Soviet Union and the United States and around the world.

The statement by the U.S. President before his departure for Malta has much in common with the Soviet president's words.

"We both want to build a sustained relationship for real achievements over the long term," Bush said. "We can find areas of shared concern and mutual advantage. Above all, we can work toward a level of European security, prosperity and peace as yet unknown in our lifetime."

The U.S. President described the Maltese meeting as historic and stressed that the leaders of the two countries "are both working to make the world a more peaceful one."

Both sides insist that the agenda of the meeting will be broad and practically unlimited, with arms control being one of the central issues. Although one can hardly expect any formal agreements on specific issues to be signed, the summit is likely to result in the elaboration of some general formulas, which could be later discussed and finalised by negotiators.

There is no doubt that Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush will focus on the dynamic processes of change in East European countries.

Conflicts in other region of the world—Central America, Afghanistan and the Middle East—are likely to feature prominently as well.

Correspondent on Start of Talks

LD0212143789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Excerpts] The 2-day meeting between Soviet leader Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush began on Malta today. Our special correspondent, Andrey Ptashnikov, reports from Valetta:

[Ptashnikov] The meeting began at 1000 local time, that is noon Moscow time [0900 GMT] [passage omitted]

The television monitor has just shown a very short clip of Comrade Gorbachev and President Bush meeting on board the Maksim Gorkiy. After they had greeted each other and the members of the delegations, the journalists on board the ship had literally just a few minutes to photograph the leaders of the two countries and ask them a few questions. In reply to one of them, about what the talks would start with, Comrade Gorbachev replied jokingly that probably they should start by destroying the ships on which, due to the bad weather, they were unable to start the talks. In that way, moreover, the secret plan of decapitating the U.S. Sixth Fleet would be implemented.

After this short meeting with journalists, Comrade Gorbachev, President Bush, and the members of the two delegations went off to the specially allocated accommodation, where the talks then began.

That is the unexpected way that today began. Now I think that we have every grounds to say that the meeting between Comrade Gorbachev and President Bush is taking place, not off the coast of Malta, but virtually on the shore. True, the change in venue for the talks will not result in journalists receiving more information about them. It was known in advance that all discussions and conversations would take place behind closed doors, and this accord reached between the two sides remains in force. We will be able to learn about the course of the talks only at the end of the day, when representatives of the two sides should address journalists at separate briefings. However I will try to report on this in my next appearance on the air.

PRAVDA on Start of Meeting

PM0212235989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 89 First Edition pp 1, 4

[Dispatch by Special correspondent G. Vasilyev from on board the liner "Maksim Gorkiy": "Making Adjustment for the Weather: Summit Meeting Has Begun"]

[Excerpts] Marsaxlokk Bay, Malta, 2 Dec—The 21-gun salute which resounded twice at Luqa Airport signaled the arrival of two countries' leaders whose meeting has been awaited with growing interest both here, in Malta, and far from its shores.

This morning saw the opening of the working session, if such a term may be used to describe the unconstrained but intensive conversations between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush.

But it did not all begin as planned. The Soviet cruiser *Slava* was supposed to be first to offer hospitality to the two countries' leaders. Then the U.S. cruiser *Belknap*. But as if to prove that objective factors are sometimes stronger than man's intentions, nature intervened. During the night the wind rose. The sea began to cut up, with greenish waves topped with white crests. In these conditions it would have been a difficult job to board the cruiser. This was when the Soviet passenger liner *Maksim Gorkiy* which was moored to the quay proved useful. It was decided to hold the first day's talks aboard it.

The time was approaching 1000 hours. The scene was deck six of the Soviet liner. M.S. Gorbachev and members of the Soviet delegation appeared in front of the entrance. The members of the U.S. delegation began arriving—Secretary of State Baker, the President's National Security Adviser Scowcroft, and the others. Then President Bush. M.S. Gorbachev welcomed him aboard the Soviet liner. The two countries' leaders shook hands.

"You see how everything changes," M.S. Gorbachev said to G. Bush. "The international situation, the weather...."

Journalists surrounded the leaders and began asking questions.

"Do you intend to reduce NATO's armed forces, Mr President?" Western correspondents asked G. Bush.

"We will discuss a broad range of questions," the President answered with a stock phrase.

"And you, Mr Gorbachev, are you going to reduce the Warsaw Pact's forces?" journalists asked the Soviet leader.

"The first thing we are going to do," M.S. Gorbachev joked, "is to scrap these two warships on which we were unable to meet...."

In this way the unofficial Soviet-U.S. summit began. The elements made their own changes to the sides' prearranged protocol. But they could not prevent the beginning of the dialogue that the whole world needs so much.

The working meeting between the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. President will end Sunday. The whole world's press, whose representatives have really taken Malta over, are speculating on what the real outcome of the "interim" unofficial Soviet-U.S. "summit" will be.

Journalists quickly filed an account of the short statement which the Soviet leader gave at the airport.

As for the U.S. President, correspondents read with interest the message which the head of the White House gave to the press. Bush states that he has set out "in search of greater mutual understanding between the two world superpowers" and that he intends to "repeat to Gorbachev that he wishes perestroyka and glasnost success."

The apparent simplicity of the meeting's "scenario" hides quite a few mysteries. What new ideas will the meeting produce? Will it give an impetus to Soviet-U.S. contacts? After the meeting what form will personal relations take between the two politicians who are so dissimilar not only in their ideological make up, but also in temperament? Everyone understands that at a Soviet-U.S. summit they discuss problems of world stature—questions of international security, arms reduction, and the principles of states' conduct in our difficult and highly dynamic times. [passage omitted]

By the time you hold this issue of the paper in your hands the first day of the Soviet-U.S. meeting off the coast of Malta will already be over.

Even though the sky is sometimes overcast and there are occasional rain showers, the mood here is good, like the weather the day before the meeting. Both the international relations professionals and people not involved in politics expect the meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders to make a real contribution to the development of a constructive Soviet-U.S. dialogue and the process of improving the world atmosphere.

Gorbachev, Bush Meet, Answer Questions

LD0212223589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 2 December, within the "Vremya" program, carries a video report on Soviet President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Malta on 2 December for talks with U.S. President George Bush.

The report says that after an airport welcoming ceremony Gorbachev and his delegation proceeded to the residence of the Maltese prime minister. Cheering, waving crowds are shown applauding as black limousines go past. Gorbachev is shown waving from the steps of a building, then climbing a staircase with his wife Raisa.

The announcer says: "Edward Fenech Adami, the Maltese prime minister, and Mrs Adami met Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his wife at his residence. There was a brief conversation between the leaders of the two countries, a sort of quick exchange of opinions on issues which are of the greatest interest to them. The conversation was subsequently continued in an expanded form with members of the Soviet delegation and the Maltese Government taking part." The video shows Gorbachev talking to Adami and then the two men continuing their talks with others, including Shevardnadze and Yakovlev, looking on.

The report goes on to note the terrible weather and to show choppy seas, stormy weather, and the hull of the Maksim Gorkiy at anchor. Bush is shown approaching and shaking hands with Gorbachev. The two exchange a few inaudible words as the cameras click. Then Bush shakes hands with Yakovlev and Shevardnadze. The U.S. President can be heard talking about when he last met members of the Soviet delegation and Gorbachev is seen shaking hands with Scowcroft. The video shows the two leaders facing journalists' questions.

[Unidentified speaker in English with superimposed Russian translation] "Mr President, will you be reducing armed forces in the world?"

[Bush in English with superimposed Russian translation] "We will be discussing a wide range of issues, a very wide range of issues."

[Unidentified speaker] "President Gorbachev, will you reduce the Warsaw Pact?"

[Gorbachev] "The first thing we shall do is this. We must eliminate the sort of ship that you can't board in bad weather. [laughter] We have a secret scheme to decapitate the sixth fleet here." [laughter]

The video shows Shevardnadze, Gorbachev, and Yakovlev sitting opposite Bush and the other U.S. delegation members at the talks table. Gorbachev is shown close up. He says "we welcome you. We welcome you Mr President and your very close colleagues."

The *Maksim Gorkiy* is shown in dock with a row of flags flapping in the wind before a brief clip of Gorbachev and Bush side by side on a sofa. The reporter says: "Naturally the most important thing is the direct talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush, the one to one talks so to speak. How are they going? That is the question on everyone's lips."

Weather Interrupts Meetings

LD0212183189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We have just received a press release from the White House press center. It reports that the talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush have been interrupted due to a storm. President Bush cannot be taken off the ship the *Belknap*. It is not yet known when the talks will resume.

First Phase of Talks Ends

LD0212125889 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Valletta December 2 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

The first phase of the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents has just ended on board the Soviet cruiseliner Maksim Gorkiy. Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush had a one-on-one meeting.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker held a simultaneous meeting.

The storm in Malta has not subsided. The Soviet and American delegations agreed that the site of further rounds of the summit would be determined according to the weather.

Baker, Shevardnadze on Significance

LD0212164689 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Excerpt] Valletta December 2 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

After the first round of Soviet-U.S. talks off Malta, Mikhail Gorbachev gave a lunch for the U.S. President. During the lunch the two leaders continued their conversation.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told TASS that the beginning of the Malta summit promises positive results from the meeting on the whole. Baker also stressed that his talks with Eduard Shevardnadze reflected not only the complete range of issues discussed a summit level but also the atmosphere of the talks.

Shevardnadze, who agreed with his American counterpart, said that among the Soviet-U.S. summits, Malta

will undoubtedly have great significance for Soviet-U.S. relations and for world affairs on the whole. [passage omitted on possible itinerary for remainder of day]

More on Baker, Shevardnadze Remarks

LD0212185989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] The unofficial meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush is taking place in Malta. Our special correspondent Andrey Ptashnikov reports from Valletta:

[Ptashnikov] At the time when this newscast is on the air, the second meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush will be taking place aboard the Soviet motor vessel "Maksim Gorkiy," following a short break for lunch. Simultaneously, the discussions continue between members of the Soviet and U.S. delegations. I will remind you that all the negotiations are taking place behind closed doors, so there is no particular information about what precise issues are being discussed. Journalists hoped to receive at least minimum information from Comrade Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, and U.S. Secretary of State Baker. They, just as the leaders of the two states, held a separate conversation in the morning, and as soon as it ended and the two ministers left the cabin, they were immediately surrounded by correspondents. Everyone had the same question: How are the talks proceeding? The replies were the following:

[Begin recording] [Baker, in English fading to superimposed translation] I think we had a very good beginning of the dialogue. We have just had an opportunity to hold a meeting between the two ministers after there was a meeting of our two leaders. I think that both these meetings represent an excellent beginning.

[Unidentified correspondent] Do you agree?

[Shevardnadze] I agree. As Mr Baker has already said, I think that the conversation that has taken place between Comrade Gorbachev and President Bush bears important and fundamental significance for Soviet-U.S. relations and for world policy. This is no exaggeration. (?We had a very useful discussion of everything) for the realization of the ideas that have been advanced jointly. But everything is continuing. [end recording]

[Ptashnikov] Indeed, everything is continuing. The talks will, at the very least, continue until 2200 Moscow time [1900 gmt].

Later there will be a dinner in honor of Comrade Gorbachev and the members of the Soviet delegation on behalf of U.S. President Bush.

Incidentally, along with the talks, torrential rain and a storm- force wind are continuing in Malta. It was precisely this that was the reason for the transfer of the venue for the meetings on the first day from the cruiser "Slava" to the motor vessel "Maksim Gorkiy." "Slava" and the U.S. cruiser "Belknap" are anchored in the middle of Valletta Bay, where a storm is raging. The "Maksim Gorkiy" is moored to the shore. Therefore, there is much less roll. Moreover, the motor vessel has considerably more powerful stabilizers. This is the news for now.

TASS Previews Next Round of Talks

LD0312090189 Moscow TASS in English 0840 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

President Gorbachev and President Bush are expected to continue their summit in Malta today.

On Saturday, the two leaders met one-on-one aboard the Maxim Gorkiy Soviet liner moored in the Valletta port, after strong winds and high waves forced them to switch the venue of their talks from the Slava Soviet cruiser to the liner. The meeting caused a wide public response everywhere in the world.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker also began their talks on the Maxim Gorkiy on Saturday.

After Gorbachev and Bush ended the first round of their talks, the Soviet leader hosted a luncheon in honour of the President of the United States. Gorbachev and Bush continued their discussions during the ceremony.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told TASS that the start of the Malta meeting spelled progress for the summit.

Baker said his talks with Shevardnadze focused on the same issues as the summit between Gorbachev and Bush and were equally constructive.

The Malta summit will have a great impact on the superpower relations and on global politics, Shevardnadze said, echoing Baker.

Before the start of the second round of talks, Soviet and American officials agreed that the venue for the second day of talks would be chosen depending on the weather.

On Sunday, Mikhail Gorbachev was scheduled to come to the U.S. cruiser Belknap for an expanded meeting with Bush, followed by another session including a limited number of Soviet and American officials.

After the talks, Gorbachev and Bush are expected to make a joint statement for the press.

The two leaders may also hold a press conference.

Bad weather conditions might force the sides to change their schedule for today.

Gorbachev, Bush Resume Talks 3 Dec

LD0312101889 Moscow TASS in English 1012 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Valletta December 3 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

The Soviet and the American Presidents today continued their political dialogue. Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush began their unofficial meeting's second round which is expected to continue for more than two hours.

Owing to adverse weather, the two presidents agreed to continue the talks on board the Soviet cruise liner Maksim Gorkiy, and not on board the cruiser Slava or the Belknap, as had been planned earlier.

Political analysts praise the results of the two presidents' first round of talks which had continued for more than five hours instead of the planned two on board the Soviet cruise liner on Saturday.

The two sides referred to the session as exceptionally successful and productive.

The session focussed primarily on disarmament issues. Attention was drawn to the need to expedite the talks on a 50-per cent cut in strategic offensive arms.

It became known to journalists that the American delegation suggested in particular that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze meet in January 1990 to discuss the course of the talks.

Besides, it was suggested that an agreement on a 50-per cent cut in strategic offensive arms be signed at a full-scale summit meeting in the United States in June next year.

One of central items on the Soviet and American Presidents' agenda today is expected to be the discussion of the idea, expressed by Gorbachev during his visit to Italy, to hold a Helsinki-2 conference on security and cooperation in Europe with the participation of 35 countries, including the United States and Canada, next year.

Gerasimov Says Talks 'Proceeding Well'

LD0312093489 Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush are holding another nonofficial meeting today.

On Saturday, because of a heavy storm, they were able to hold only one round of talks aboard the Soviet motor vessel "Maksim Gorkiy."

According to spokesman of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Gennadiy Gerasimov, talks between the two leaders are proceeding well and they've already touched on all the issues of the agenda. Special attention was paid to reductions of strategic offensive weapons and also of conventional weapons in Europe.

White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater noted that among the questions discussed were the economic situation in Eastern Europe, the situation in Central America, and also bilateral cooperation.

According to news agencies, President Bush presented the Soviet side with 15 proposals on various issues. In particular they provide for a meeting between the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, and the American state secretary, James Baker, on strategic offensive weapons in January.

President Bush suggested that the new Soviet-American summit be held in late June. The proposals also deal with chemical weapons cuts, a stop to nuclear testing and other matters.

Gorbachev, Bush Hold News Conference

LD0312134989 Moscow World Service in English 1330 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] President Gorbachev and President Bush have held a press conference on board the "Maxim Gorkiy," the first ever joint press conference of the two nations' leaders.

The 8 hours of talks spanned the broadest range of issues from the limitation of strategic nuclear arms (?to) conventional arms in Europe, and from the situation in the Middle East to the current economic problems in Eastern Europe.

In their brief statements before answering questions from newsmen, both President Bush and President Gorbachev sounded clearly pleased with the results of their talks. Some of the crucial issues under discussion, they said, had been thrashed out so that specific agreements could be prepared for signing in time for their scheduled official summit in Washington in June.

Much of the question and answer session that followed the two Presidents' statements dealt with economic cooperation between the two nations, and also the situation in Central America, involving particularly Nicaragua and El Salvador.

Press Conference Statements

PM0412123189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Statements by M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush"]

[Text] Valletta, 3 Dec—A press conference was held on board the Soviet motor ship *Maksim Gorkiy* following the conclusion of the interim unofficial meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet,

and U.S. President G. Bush. G. Bush and M.S. Gorbachev delivered introductory statements at the press conference.

G. Bush declared:

Ladies and gentlemen!

President Gorbachev kindly suggested that I speak first.

I would like to thank the captain and crew of the *Belknap* for the great support they have given us. Special thanks to the captain and crew of the *Maksim Gorkiy* for their hospitality. Thanks to the captain and crew of the *Slava.*

I first put the idea of holding such an unofficial meeting to Chairman Gorbachev after my trip to Europe in July. The amazing changes I observed in Poland and Hungary, the encouraging changes, prompted me to arrive at the conviction that the time had come to sit down face to face with Chairman Gorbachev and see what we could do together to take advantage of the opportunities opening up before us to advance these relations. He agreed with this concept of a meeting, and we quickly reached agreement. I believe that the unusual events in Europe since the meeting was suggested have only reinforced the importance of our meeting. So I am especially pleased that we have held this meeting and have really gained a better impression of each other's views. We have prepared the ground for progress on a broad range of problems. And even though it is not up to the United States and the Soviet Union to decide the Europeans' future, I am convinced that U.S.-Soviet relations based on cooperation can really make the future safer and brighter.

There is virtually no problem in the world, and certainly no problem in Europe, whose solution could not be facilitated by an improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations. Improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations is valuable in itself, but it must also be an instrument for positive changes throughout the world. For 40 years now the Western alliances have jointly acted in support of freedom. Now that reforms are being implemented in the Soviet Union, we are on the threshold of a completely new era in U.S.-Soviet relations.

It is within our power to make our contribution, each side in its own way, toward overcoming the split in Europe and putting an end to military confrontation there. We must do more to reduce the violence and suffering which have been the lot of so many regions of the globe and to eliminate the common threats to our future.

Pollution of the environment, the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons and of the technology for producing ballistic missiles, drug trafficking—our discussions here will provide an added stimulus to the achievement of real progress in these spheres.

There is tremendous potential for further developing common opportunities. For example, the Soviet Union now desires more active participation in the international market economy—a step which I am certainly prepared to encourage in every possible way.

On leaving Malta for Brussels to meet with our NATO allies I hope that, as the West makes patient joint efforts and steadily expands cooperation with the Soviet Union, we will be able to ensure lasting peace and to transform East-West relations on the basis of long-term cooperation. This is the future our peoples deserve, this is the future I want to help build, and this is the future Chairman Gorbachev and I have ushered in here in Malta.

M.S. Gorbachev declared:

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen!
Comrades!

There are many symbols here at this meeting. This is the latest of them: I think there has been no previous occasion in history when the leaders of our two states have held a joint press conference. This is also an important symbol. I go along with President Bush in the opinion that we are generally satisfied with the results of this meeting. We perceive this meeting as an unofficial meeting—this is how it was conceived. The idea belongs to President Bush, and I supported it ardently—to hold such an unofficial meeting, not to confine it to a preapproved agenda, and to hold a free exchange of opinions. The time is making great demands of our countries, and this naturally enhances their responsibility and role, and I can assure you that throughout the discussions—we have calculated that these discussions lasted a total of 8 hours—this responsibility was present on both sides. Our meeting was marked by a good atmosphere, openness, and a wide-ranging exchange of opinions.

Now it would be difficult—and maybe even pointless—to give you a list of the problems we discussed. Nonetheless, I would like to say right away that we tried to present our positions on all major problems frankly, with each side offering arguments: as regards the appraisal of the situation and the ongoing changes in the world and in Europe; as regards disarmament problems, including the process of talks in Geneva and Vienna; and as regards the talks on elaborating a convention to ban chemical weapons. All these questions were thoroughly discussed.

The President and I deemed it necessary to exchange opinions on how we in Moscow and Washington perceive the situation in the planet's hotspots. This exchange was very substantive and constructive. We reaffirmed our former positions regarding the fact that all these problems, these acute problems, must be solved by political methods. This, I believe, was another important conclusion.

We did not simply discuss problems and outline our positions. It seems to me that on both sides there were numerous points where, provided they are taken into account in subsequent actions by both governments, we can expect progress.

This also applies to talks, to the topic of reducing strategic offensive arms by 50 percent. We optimistically appraised the possibility of arriving at the conclusion of treaties in Vienna as early as next year, and we are both

in favor—this is of course our own position, we can only speak for ourselves—of this document being signed at summit level.

This time we spoke a lot about bilateral relations. For my part, I want to note the many positive points and proposals contained in President Bush's remarks on this account. Thus I would say that we confirmed the continuity of political course in all avenues of political dialogue, of our discussions, including bilateral relations—and I must say this because this was our first, albeit unofficial, meeting with Mr Bush in his present capacity. The confirmation of continuity is an important element, but an equally important point is the fact that, even at this unofficial meeting, we have—I think—created some groundwork for building up this capital. This, as the President and I see it, is primarily in line with the interests of our two countries and people but is also in line with the interests of the entire world community. In general, contacts have been established, good contacts, the atmosphere was friendly, direct, and open, and this enabled us to do some good work.

The most dangerous thing in our situation is to lapse into exaggeration. It is probably always necessary to maintain elements of caution. Here I am using Mr President Bush's favorite word. (Animation).

Our world and our relations are at a crucial stage. We must act very responsibly to ensure that we rise to the challenge of the times. We leaders of such states cannot act as firefighters, even though firefighting teams perform useful work. This must also be borne in mind.

I would like to thank the President once more for his idea of this meeting, with which we are satisfied. I would like to say words of gratitude to the people of Malta and the Government of Malta for their hospitality. Thank you, Mr President, for your cooperation.

M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush then replied to journalists' questions.

Statements to Correspondents

LD0312141389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Valetta, 3 December—TASS special correspondents report:

George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev made statements to journalists on board the vessel "Maksim Gorkiy" today following the completion of a series of meetings which have taken place over 2 days off the coast of Malta.

Both leaders expressed satisfaction with the results of the talks, which continued for a total of about 8 hours.

Mikhail Gorbachev, in particular, said that all of the discussions were characterized by a responsible approach on the part of both sides and took place in a good atmosphere. He noted that on all major problems both sides frankly presented their positions, including those concerning the assessment of the situation in Europe and the world, of the problems of disarmament and the process of talks in Geneva and Vienna, and also the talks on the preparation of a convention banning chemical weapons. All of these questions were thoroughly discussed, the Soviet leadeer said. He also stated that the problems of the "hot spots" of the world were examined from the positions of Moscow and Washington, and stressed that this was an exchange that was very rich in content.

For his part, the President of the United States noted that the leaders of the two countries had achieved a deeper understanding of each other's views. During the course of the meetings, he said, ways had been mapped out for progress over a wide range of issues. Although it is not up to the United States and the USSR to determine the future for Europeans or other peoples, George Bush stressed, I am convinced that the development of Soviet-U.S. relations in a spirit of cooperation can indeed make the world more secure and bright. There is practically no problem in the world, and no problem in Europe, the solution of which would not be furthered by an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, the U.S. President said.

According to George Bush, an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations is important not just in itself. It should also become a tool for positive changes in the world. It is within our power to make a contribution to overcoming the division of Europe and ending military confrontation, he said. We must also put an end to violence and the sufferings which have affected so many parts of the world and eliminate the overall threat to our future.

Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush then replied to numerous questions from journalists.

More on Leaders' Comments to Press

LD0312163189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1516 GMT 3 Dec 89

["Press conference by Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush"—TASS headline]

[Text] Valetta, 3 Dec (TASS)—TASS special correspondents report:

The Soviet Union will never start a "hot" war against the United States, stated Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, addressing a press conference held jointly with George Bush, the U.S. President, on the results of the 2-day meeting in Malta. We want our relations with the United States to remain good, the Soviet leader stressed, creating a foundation for the further development of cooperation in various fields. The period of the "cold war" is finally disappearing into the past, making room for a new era, Mikhail Gorbachev stated. In the course of a discussion with the U.S. President, both leaders came to the conclusion that the new era demands new political

approaches, expressed in the rejection of confrontation, enmity, the arms race, and distrust.

Answering a question about his assessment of the current situation in Central America, Mikhail Gorbachev said that this problem was discussed at the meeting. He confirmed once again the fact that the Soviet Union is not supplying arms to El Salvador. Mikhail Gorbachev assured the leader of the United States that the USSR has a fundamental interest in a political settlement in that region. The Soviet leader expressed confidence that the possibility for achieving peace in Central America does exist.

Dealing with the prospects for economic cooperation between the USSR and the United States, President George Bush said that thorough discussions had been held on this topic in Malta. In particular, the issue of creating conditions under which U.S. businessmen would be able to give assistance in carrying out the reforms that have been started by Mikhail Gorbachev was examined, the President said.

The Soviet leader confirmed the U.S. President's remarks. What took place at the meeting, he pointed out, can be seen as a political impulse, which had been absent, so that Soviet-U.S. economic cooperation could gather momentum and assume forms and dimensions commensurate with the potential of both countries and with the current situation. Currently, he continued, everything is being done in the USSR for the Soviet economy to be turned more resolutely toward being geared toward ties and cooperation with other countries, and so that it organically forms part of the world economic system.

During the conversations with George Bush, Mikhail Gorbachev said further when replying to a question put by a journalist, the sides could not but touch on the situation in the Lebanon. He emphasized that the soviet and U.S. peoples alike feel sympathy toward the people of Lebanon, perceiving the suffering, difficulties, and trials that have befallen them. Mikhail Gorbachev stated that there had been an exchange of information, views, and appraisals on this question during the talks. The sides, according to him, have agreed to maintain the exchange of views, and to facilitate a successful settlement of this conflict.

Replying to a question about the roles of the USSR and the United States in settling the Near East conflict, President George Bush said that in his view the USSR is playing a constructive role in Lebanon, favoring a trilateral agreement on Lebanon, supported also by the United States. He expressed confidence in the fact that the Soviet side shares the U.S. viewpoint concerning the necessity of a peaceful solution to the conflict in the Near East.

This subject was thoroughly discussed during the meeting, added Mikhail Gorbachev. There is an understanding that both sides should facilitate a settlement of this protracted conflict by acting independently, yet in conjunction with each other.

TASS on Meeting With Press

LD0312200689 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Valletta December 3 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

The Soviet Union will never start a war against the United States, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said today at a joint news conference with U.S. President George Bush at the close of their two-day Malta meeting.

"We want our relations with the United States to remain good, furnishing groundwork for the further development of cooperation in various fields," he emphasised.

The cold war is finally receding into the past, giving way to a new era, Gorbachev said.

The two presidents agreed that a new era calls for new political approaches manifesting themselves in the renunciation of confrontation, hostility, arms race and distrust.

In answer to a question about an estimate of the current situation in Central America, Gorbachev said the problem was discussed at the summit.

He confirmed once again that the Soviet Union did not supply weapons to the El Salvador rebels.

He said he assured the U.S. President that the Soviet Union favoured a political settlement in the region. Gorbachev voiced confidence that it was possible to achieve peace in Central America.

Touching upon the prospects for Soviet-American cooperation, President Bush said detailed discussions on the subject were held during the summit and that the two presidents considered in particular the question of creating conditions under which U.S. businessmen could give assistance in carrying out the reforms launched by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Soviet president confirmed Bush's remarks. What was done at this meeting can be viewed as a political impulse which was needed for Soviet-American economic cooperation to develop and assume forms and a scope adequate to the resources of the two countries and the current situation, he said.

Everything is being done in the Soviet Union to turn the economy more firmly towards contacts and cooperation with other countries, so that it could be organically integrated into the world economic system, Gorbachev said.

In answer to a journalist's question, Gorbachev said that during the talks with Bush the sides could not bypass the situation in Lebanon.

He emphasised that both the Soviet and American peoples sympathise with and take close to heart the anguish, difficulties and ordeals that have befallen the people of Lebanon.

There was an exchange of information, views and assessments on the issue during the talks, Gorbachev said. The sides agreed to maintain the exchange of views and promote a successful solution to the conflict.

In answer to a question about the role of the Soviet Union and the United States in a settlement of the Middle East conflict, President Bush said that the Soviet Union plays a constructive role in Lebanon and favors a tripartite agreement on Lebanon, which the United States also supports.

He voiced confidence that the Soviet side shares the U.S. view of the need for a peaceful solution to the conflict in the Middle East.

The subject was thoroughly discussed during the meeting, Gorbachev added. There is understanding that the two sides should promote a solution to this protracted conflict by acting independently and cooperating with each other.

Journalists were interested in the Soviet leader's viewpoint on the situation in Eastern Europe. Gorbachev stressed that he did not want to be regarded here as a representative of all East European countries.

The USSR is a part of Eastern Europe and interacts with its allies in all spheres, he continued. The changes in the Soviet Union and East European countries have been objectively prepared by historical progress.

These problems should be tackled in a new way, with the use of experience and potentialities accumulated in these states, as well as all positive things accumulated by human civilisation.

The Soviet leader expressed the opinion that the changes in Eastern Europe should be welcomed, since they are connected with the desire of peoples to lend a more democratic and human character to these societies.

He also noted that the USSR regards "the German question" from the position of the Helsinki process. Gorbachev said that actualities of life are such that in Europe there are two German states, the Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic. And any artificial attempt to do anything with "the German question" can hamper processes in the development of European states.

Touching on this question, President Bush stressed that the United States has a longstanding position that the borders in Europe were determined by the Helsinki conference.

The President expressed satisfaction with changes in the GDR. However, it is not the U.S. task to dictate the rate of changes in any countries. This is the task of peoples living in these countries.

Asked about the U.S. stand on cutting the two sides' naval forces, the U.S. President noted that differences are still persisting between the two sides in this field. But in his opinion, the main thing is that the sides could discuss these problems in a very constructive atmosphere.

Assessing the development of the Helsinki process, Gorbachev said that the meeting revealed understanding of its importance by the sides.

He emphasised that the sides favoured the development of the Helsinki process in line with the imperatives of our times in order to build a new Europe based on changes bringing closer European nations. This is the cause of all European countries as well as the United States and Canada, the Soviet leader said.

Amplifying this topic, Gorbachev pointed to the need to transform European institutions. This would accord with undergoing changes. He noted that NATO and the Warsaw Treaty should also change their nature, turning from military into military-political and then into political organisations.

In his opinion, changes in Europe should develop so as to improve relations there and to strengthen stability and security.

Asked whether specific understandings have been reached on cutting nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons, Gorbachev noted that the sides discussed this issue in detail, which is corroborated by an understanding on holding a meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker to bring positions closer together.

According to the Soviet leader, the U.S. President set out interesting proposals on chemical weapons, and there is a chance for a rapid advance towards a settlement of this problem.

As for the problem of cutting strategic weapons Gorbachev said that the sides can evidently draft the main provisions of an agreement and prepare it for signing by the second, this time, full- scale Soviet-American summit. (It is scheduled for the latter part of next June).

Speaking of the development of Soviet-American relations, Bush compared them with snow-balling. They are steadily developing, he added. Everything happening in the USSR under the leadership of Gorbachev, enjoys tremendous support in the United States.

Asked by journalists about personal relationship between the two leaders, the U.S. President said that there is a good personal relationship between him and Gorbachev. This helps each side to be frank and not to duck the examination of outstanding problems, which, in his opinion, is very important.

On his part, the Soviet leader stressed that the present summit has brought personal contacts with the U.S. President to a higher level and expressed satisfaction with the meetings and talks with him.

Gorbachev TV Interview

LD0312193989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Dec 89

[From the "Seven Days" program—recorded]

[Text] [S. Slipchenko] Also today, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave an interview to Soviet Television.

[Gorbachev] This was an unofficial meeting. Its task was not to develop agreements, let alone to sign them. The meeting was aimed at holding a large-scale dialogue and comparing evaluations. Considering the fact that the administration has changed, one had to clarify things—particularly on such a cardinal question of whether or not the new Administration is adhering to continuity in policy, especially in the Soviet-U.S. area.

I would say that first of all, of course, one could speak about political results in connection with the nature of the meeting, but you know, people often wish to have some concrete results immediately. This is understandable. I must say that it is difficult to count on concrete results without political understanding.

I would give, above all, the following evaluation of the importance of this meeting with the U.S. President: It has created good premises for attaining, in the future, concrete results in very many fields. I think now processes will be developing in a more dynamic way in all the areas of our interaction and cooperation with the Americans.

PRAVDA Cites Gorbachev on Meeting

PM0412004189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

["M.S. Gorbachev Interview for Soviet Television"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Prior to taking off from Valetta, M.S. Gorbachev gave an interview for Soviet Television on the results of the interim unofficial meeting with G. Bush off Malta.

Question: Mikhail Sergeyevich, your meeting with President Bush off Malta has only just ended. It took place, one could say, at a crucial moment in the completely new situation that is taking shape. What effect did this have on the conversations you had with the President?

Answer: The crucial nature of the present situation with its tremendous importance for Europe and the world was present during the wide-ranging political dialogue with the U.S. President. It was the third party at the meeting. It was the responsibility, the wide-ranging nature of these changes, and their fundamental importance for the future of individual peoples and continents and of the world as a whole that prompted the President and me to meet here in Malta ahead of the official meeting scheduled for next year. It was President Bush's idea but we responded ardently and supported him.

The world is moving out of one era and stepping into another. We all sense this, but the important point is to make a correct appraisal and to elaborate a suitable [adekvatnyy] policy on the basis of this appraisal. Now it is very important to avoid any false steps, any political miscalculations, and especially any irresponsibility. This would dearly cost all countries in the West and the East alike, all over the world.

It is especially important that these processes are acquiring such a dynamic nature here, on the European Continent. I have long spoken about Europe's role. Now I would like to say that I perceive in the ongoing changes a confirmation of forecasts of how matters would develop here and how matters would develop in the world. These are changes for the better. The East European countries are changing, the Soviet Union is changing. The Western countries are also changing. Substantial changes are also occurring in politics and the economy, in the social sphere, and in intergration processes.

Speaking of the overall thrust of these changes, a countermovement has also developed. This means that new opportunities are emerging, the world is breaking away from the "cold war" and is entering, as we assume and hope, a prolonged period of peaceful development.

Question: Mikhail Sergeyevich, your words were "is breaking away." Does this mean that it has not yet completely broken away?

Answer: I would like to say: The "cold war" is over. This is basically true. Nonetheless, a lot is still left over from this period in the attitudes and foreign policy activity of individual states. The instruments which that era produced are still with us. Indeed, there is a breaking away from all that is old, but this will not be an easy process. We can already sense this. I would very much like, in this conversation of ours, to welcome the responsibility shown by the majority of politicans who realize that an opportunity of tremendous importance has been provided, an opportunity for which we have waited a long time and toward which we have been working—and it must not be missed. I think that the choice has already been determined to a certain extent, but there are forces which would like to see both the new Europe and the new world restructured on the basis of the mechanisms produced by the "cold war." I think that if the "cold war" did prove anything, it was that reliance on strength and confrontation has not justified itself. The arms race brought mankind to a dangerous brink, and a real survival problem emerged. The "cold war" methods have been defeated. I deem it important to emphasize this because every now and then we come across a different sort of reasoning: You see, it is claimed, it was the "cold war" policy that brought about the changes. Absurd logic. It originates from those who are even now reluctant to part company with the old baggage. This will produce nothing. We will neither build a new Europe nor restructure international relations if we persist in old approaches, if we try to solve new problems on the basis of old approaches.

This is why we talk about Helsinki-1 and note its positive results. But a new stage is opening up in the Helsinki process. And we are talking about Helsinki-2. It is necessary to interpret the present changes, to collectively discuss and map out the stages of movement toward a new Europe, toward new international relations. I always speak of Europe and international relations in the same breath, because Europe is such an important part of today's civilization, because what is happening here has a very powerful effect on the international situation as a whole. It seems to me that common sense will prevail. And perhaps the greatest hope is that the working people's masses will enter the political arena. These people do not wish to submissively and without any say entrust their future to the hands of politicians alone. They wish to be parties to and makers of the new policy. Look at the last few days of contacts in Italy: People's response to the changes going on in the Soviet Union, the sympathy, the support!

Question: Evidently President Bush felt this also?

Answer: I found a great deal of realism in the opinions of President Bush and I must say that I felt his desire to understand these processes, to exchange opinions on the progress of the profound changes, to compare assessments, and, maybe, to work out some sort of approaches. I don't believe that I can say today that such approaches have already taken shape, but the dialogue proved to be on a very wide scale. I would say this: He even surpassed my expectations.

Question: What, in your opinion, are the most substantial results of the meeting on Malta with President Bush, and what difficult important issues did you manage to agree on?

Answer: You know that the meeting was an unofficial one, that its task was not the formulation of agreements, even less so their signing. The meeting was aimed at conducting a wide-ranging dialogue, at comparing assessments. And insofar as there has been a change of administration, also to determine our position on such a cardinal issue as: Has there been continuity of policy with the new administration, in particular, in the area of Soviet-U.S. relations. It is primarily possible to talk about political results in connection with the nature of the meeting. People frequently want specific results right away. This is understandable. But I must say that, without political understanding, it is difficult to count on specific results. I would evaluate the significance of this meeting with the U.S. President above all by the fact that it creates good preconditions for arriving in the future at a great many avenues to specific results.

I believe that processes will now move more dynamically in all areas of our collaboration and cooperation with the Americans. Very serious impetus has been imparted to the negotiating processes in Vienna. Naturally, it is not we alone who determine the fate of these negotiations, but a very great deal depends on us and on the Americans. Very serious impetus has been imparted to ensuring that by June, when my official meeting with the U.S. President is to take place, proposals would have been prepared for the solution of all the problems which have not yet been resolved. In other words, that we would already have examined all the chief factors by that time and determined our position on them with a view to arriving within a few months at the signing of a treaty. A major treaty. An epoch-making treaty.

Prompt [replika]: Indeed, nothing like it before.

Gorbachev: Yes, nothing like it before. Of course, in nuclear disarmament the first step is important, and what was signed with President Reagan—that is important, that has taken its place in history. But on these issues, I believe that, as a result of the exchange of opinions, it is possible to expect a large-scale breakthrough. As far as chemical weapons are concerned, there has been much that has confused us recently in the Americans' position. At this meeting certain new, very important elements were set out which allow us to expect that here, too, the process will be moved forward.

We had a thorough [osnovatelno] discussion of the Vienna process and arrived at the stage whereby next year at summit level we can and we must sign a treaty on reducing conventional armaments and forces. Such is the military-political side of the meeting.

I must say that for the first time the President displayed interest in questions of economic cooperation with our country, and this is very important because this topic has always remained outside the basic context of all meetings and conversations.

Prompt: This is the point which concerns not only general policy but also, one could say, every Soviet person?

Gorbachev: Yes. Your remark is right. This is the element which shows that the present U.S. Administration headed by President Bush not only confirms the continuity of past policy but is also already providing its own contribution and proposals which make a quite serious addition to what we had before. We are talking about creating normal conditions for economic cooperation and lifting unjustified restrictions. We are talking about Americans changing their point of view as regards the Soviet Union's presence in international economic organizations, and this is very important. Earlier they responded negatively to our participation, considering that this would only lead to the politicization of economic international organizations and unnecessary struggle, to clashes of opinions. We welcome these changes, we believe ourselves to be part of today's civilization, part of the world economy, and we wish to more fruitfully and productively cooperate and participate in the world economy's division of labor. This is normal.

We feel constrained [nam tesnovato] within the national framework, we are launching economic processes in the country which allow us to hope that our state's foreign

economic activity will grow and attain a different level of dynamism. This is a very substantial development [prirashcheniye] in the U.S. Administration's policy toward us.

I must say that U.S. business has always retained its interest, and, despite the fact that ties have not yet emerged, U.S. businessmen have always come to us, invited representatives of our business circles to visit them, and constantly conducted a dialogue in expectation of the time when the U.S. political leadership would change its stance.

I believe that it is possible to talk of such a change. But we'll see. We are realists, and we will judge by deeds.

We had a very detailed conversation about many of the planet's hot spots, about what could be done jointly and by each one of us separately to promote a political settlement of these processes. A lot of necessary and useful work will be done in the interests of peace and the maintenance of normal relations between our countries. This meets with approval in our own country and in the United States. By the way, you shared your impression that even heartland America has sensed the extent to which the public attitude toward our country and our policy has changed. This is also very important, it is another sign of a great turnabout.

Question: Mikhail Sergeyevich, if I have understood you correctly, your first major contact with the President offers grounds for believing that the Bush administration is ready for such cooperation with us?

Answer: Frankly speaking, we followed very carefully the shaping of this administration's and the President's position as regards the Soviet Union and Soviet-U.S. cooperation. We displayed patience and restraint and were right to do so, because ultimately this is within their competence, it is their prerogative, and they are responsible for their own policy. I would even say that patience has already run out in America's public circles and they have started pushing the administration. An important result. I believe the President thoroughly appraised this area of his policy and made a choice. This is a serious choice rather than a tactical move—this is my impression following these conversations. I welcome this. What is taking place in our relations impacts not only on our countries but also on the entire world situation. I hope that we are talking about a long-term approach to one another.

Question: It is well known that personality factors are of considerable importance in politics. How did relations and mutual understanding with President Bush develop on the human level?

Answer: The present meeting gives me an opportunity to say this: A good and sound beginning has been made, the atmosphere at the meeting was exceptionally amicable, open, and straightforward [pryamoy]. We had two meetings one-on-one. This enabled us to discuss topics which had not been discussed earlier. It may be that it was because Mr Bush and I had met somewhat earlier, that we had already had contacts, and we experienced no difficulties in immediately establishing a good atmosphere at the dialogue. Elements of trust have been conceived. This is good for a beginning. As far as I personally am concerned, I naturaly value this and, for my part, will do everything to ensure that this atmosphere is preserved. That it is preserved primarily in the interests of that enormous cause, that enormous responsibility borne by the two states' leaders. If the atmosphere is good, it is easier to discuss any questions and arrive at any solutions. I am satisfied with the personal contacts that have been established with the President.

Final Round of 'Maksim Gorkiy' Talks Noted

PM0412121989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under the general heading "Friendly, Direct, and Open Dialogue": "Malta Meeting Ends"]

[Text] Valletta, 3 Dec—A joint press conference—the first-ever with the Soviet and U.S. leaders' simultaneous participation—rounded up the interim unofficial meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President G. Bush off Malta yesterday. At it the Soviet and U.S. leaders talked in an exceptionally frank and sincere manner about the content of their talks and summed up their results. They reported that they had discussed questions of disarmament, bilateral relations, the situation in the world's trouble spots, the changes in the world and in Europe, and opportunities to give powerful political impetus to Soviet-U.S. economic cooperation.

It was noted that the meeting had led to the achievement of specific results in the sphere of real progress on the process for preparing a treaty on 50 percent strategic offensive arms cuts. Progress was noted on the elaboration of a convention to ban chemical weapons. The Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state were instructed to prepare for a full-scale summit between the Soviet and U.S. leaders, and the date for it was set—the first half of June next year.

The leaders of the two states noted that the Malta meetings were typified by a good atmosphere, openness, and the wide-ranging nature of the exchanges of opinions. The participants in the dialogue believe that there are still certain divergences and differences in approach to a number of issues. However, the relations established between them are conducive to the overcoming of these differences. At the same time, it was stressed that this should not affect the responsible and principled implementation of policy.

...The second and final day of the talks was also held aboard the Soviet diesel vessel the Maksim Gorkiy. By morning the weather had improved and the sun was peeking through the leaden clouds. The sea was less rough, but not so much as to allow the talks to take place on board the anchored Soviet and U.S. cruisers, as had originally been planned.

The U.S. President was welcomed aboard the diesel vessel and warmly greeted by M.S. Gorbachev. Without waiting for the planned press conference, the journalists strove to find out how the talks were going. Very good was the answer. The U.S. President was asked whether he thought his idea of meeting on board ship had been unsuccessful. "No," G. Bush replied, "it was a very good idea." "This shows," M.S. Gorbachev added, "that we can quickly adapt to a situation."

The third round of talks was held in the diesel vessel's library that morning entirely on schedule. The talks were initially held on an enlarged basis. Taking part in them on the Soviet side were: M.S. Gorbachev, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.A. Bessmertnykh, A.S. Chernyayev, A.F. Dobrynin, and S.F. Akhromeyev; and on the U.S. side: G. Bush, J. Baker, J. Sununu, R. Blackwill, D. Ross, and G. Graves [initial as published].

M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush then met for one-on-one talks.

Baker on 'Constructive' Meeting

LD0412072989 Moscow TASS in English 0723 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin:

"We are moving from competition to dialogue, and then to cooperation. And that move, I think, started a number of months ago. This meeting between the two leaders will certainly give it a major, major boost," U.S. Secretary of State James Baker said in a Sunday interview with the United States CBS "Face the Nation" programme, commenting on the unofficial Soviet-American Malta summit.

"I think we are friends. But there are still differences between us. We have some differences. But the relationship is very sound. That was a very constructive and productive meeting. It accomplished, I think, exactly what the President was seeking when he suggested it. And I know for a fact that the Soviets were very pleased with it as well," he said.

"We have made it very clear for a long time that we think it's important that perestroyka succeeded. And the reason we think it's important is because that will give us a more open, stable, and secure Soviet Union. For some time now, we have been talking to the Soviets about economic issues, through the technical economic cooperation approach."

"I will work with the Congress, consult with our Congress, to see if we can repeal some of this legislation (Jackson-Vanik Amendment) that prevents us from having more normal economic relations," the secretary of state said.

Cheney Interviewed on Meeting

LD0412064689 Moscow TASS in English 0643 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 4 TASS—In an interview with the United States NBC Television Network on Sunday U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney expressed hope that the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush would give political stimulus to headway at negotiations on strategic arsenals of the two superpowers and on conventional armaments in Europe.

"We hope that we will be able to conclude this agreement shortly," Cheney said, touching upon negotiations on NATO and Warsaw Treaty troops and armaments in Europe.

"I think it's more a matter of completing the CFE [Conventional Forces in Europe] proposal that's now on the table. We may eventually, after we've done that, want to go beyond that," he said.

"There are still several unresolved issues. Cruise missiles is at the heart of it. I can recall back in the mid-70's when we were debating how to deal with cruise missiles—what kind of limitation there should be on their range, how many there should be allowed on both sides, how we should deal with the verification problem between conventional and nuclear systems."

"I think you'll see that this will be a major issue, for example, when Secretary Baker goes to Moscow in January to meet with Shevardnadze, that they will focus on cruise missiles, especially outcomes," Cheney noted. He said he hoped the problem could be solved by June.

'Most Important' Political Event

LD0412140689 Moscow TASS in English 1323 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

The Soviet-American Malta summit is over. One can say now that the meeting will be the most important and most memorable political event in 1989.

The Soviet-American dialogue embraced such a great number of major problems of the international situation and bilateral Soviet- American relations that it will take much effort and time for political scientists and journalists to analyse all its aspects. I shall mention only three topics which appear most important.

First, the two sides noted the fact that the world is leaving the cold war age and entering a new era—an era of a durable and strong peace. The Malta meeting laid a reliable political foundation to continue this process and ensure the success of the full-scale summit in the United States next June, although preparations for the next summit will certainly require strenuous work from both sides.

It is now an indisputable fact that our country's advanced principles of new political thinking are gaining stronger footholds in practical policy and in mutual East-West relations, gradually, but steadily destroying walls of confrontation and dismantling position of strength concepts.

The Malta meeting reaffirmed the USSR's and the United States' intention to solve, step by step, the most important task, that of curbing the arms race, practically in all its areas—a 50 per cent reduction of the most formidable strategic weapons, chemical weapons or stockpiles of conventional weapons on European soil.

The world's current positive changes prompt the need to accelerate and invigorate the Helsinki process and give it a new substance. Our country's Helsinki-2 idea is therefore enlisting active and ever growing public support.

The Soviet side emphasises once again it is important to see to it that the advancement to the Helsinki-2 meeting should be based on the principles of the balance of the interests and the construction of an all-European home should not lead to destruction of the existing edifice.

This house can be erected and stand firm only on the foundation of the existing territorial and political realities that ensure the security and stability of the European continent. A balanced and responsible approach—this is what is now required from political leaders both in Europe and beyond.

The third, also very important aspect—in the course of the Soviet-American summit meeting and during Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's preceeding state visit to Italy, to the Vatican, it was most emphatically underlined: a turn to a new, better world, being advocated by an ever growing part of mankind, cannot take place without Soviet perestroyka, without the fundamental changes now taking place in East European countries, signifying a breakthrough towards democratisation and humane socialism.

"Soviet perestroyka sets the stage for a future world for all peoples," Italian writer Alberto Moravia said in Rome at a ceremony to present the gold peace dove prize to Mikhail Gorbachev. This is really so.

The British OBSERVER newspaper said that the eight-point storm off Malta's shores impelled Gorbachev and Bush to make changes in the programme of negotiations, and noted that notwithstanding the might of the two superpowers, they will be unable to cope with the forces of nature. If one is to look for a symbol in the stormy weather that led to changes in the schedule, to my mind the symbol is different: nature itself reminds the Malta participants that their path towards a durable peace, confidence and interaction is not at all easy and simple, that not only successes but also difficulties and unexpected obstacles await them on that path.

The high waves and strong winds of sixty miles per hour were unable to prevent the success of the Malta dialogue. Other obstacles likewise will not be able to prevent putting the relations between the two powers onto the footing of mutual confidence and cooperation inasmuch as their leaders are firm in their plans, ready to part with the old luggage and have the political will to attain the goal, while remaining on the ground of realism.

Such will was obvious in the course of the Malta dialogue. This makes one confident that our diversified and stormy world is really on the way to a better future.

Soltan Commentary on Results

LD0412142989 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Yuriy Soltan commentary: "The Results of the Unofficial Soviet-American Summit Off Malta"]

[Text] First of all, recall how the leaders of the two powers assessed the meeting. President Mikhail Gorbachev made this remark in an interview with Soviet television:

The meeting with the United States President was significant, above all, because it provided good prerequisites for attaining concrete results in a great many fields, said President Gorbachev. President Bush shared this view, as he said at the final news conference that the stage was set for progress on a wide range of issues.

Now what are these issues? The sides believe that by a full-scale meeting, scheduled for the second half of next June in Washington, it would be possible to work out the guidelines of a bilateral agreement on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons and prepare it for signing. The Vienna talks on conventional armed forces reduction in Europe may be successful too. There are opportunities to advance quickly toward banning chemical weapons once and for all. Of course, it's impossible to solve the problem of disarmament at one go. All the more so various approaches are in evidence, for instance in as far as naval forces reduction is concerned. But the basis for further advancement was created.

The leaders thoroughly examined the situation in the hotbeds of tension in the world. Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed the Soviet position of principle that regional problems should be settled by political means. For one thing, President Bush was told that the USSR was not supplying any weapons in Central America. Of course Moscow and Washington differ in their version of what's going on in the areas of tension, but during a lengthy discussion between President Gorbachev and President Bush the sides revealed elements that would be taken into account and would give reason to hope for progress in the field.

It is premature to say that the two countries see eye-to-eye on European problems, but the dialogue was a wide-ranging one. The main thing is the realization that Europe needs to move forward within the framework of the Helsinki process.

It's important that both leaders reiterated adherence to the course toward better Soviet-American relations in all fields, started at the Soviet-American summit in Geneva in 1985. One can fully accept President Bush's statement that American-Soviet relations along the lines of cooperation can make the future for all of us safer and brighter.

World Moving Toward 'New Era'

PM0412113389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[Aleksandr Lopukhin "View From Moscow" article: "Between Past and Future"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The new thinking that is entering international life is not an instantaneous revelation handed down to a chosen few, it is a process of apprehending existing realities and the global problems threatening the existence of civilization on earth. Here there is no room for teachers seeking to achieve unity of thought and action on the part of their pupils. Everyone learns according to his own program, but with a common goal—to ensure mankind's survival.

Many politicians, having tasted the first fruits of the new thinking in the shape of armaments either already destroyed or due to be cut back in the foreseeable future, are increasingly often talking about the end of the "cold war." But not all of this war's strongholds have been destroyed, not all the soldiers, officers, and even commanders in chief have laid down all the arms of confrontation. And this is so despite the fact that the building of the all-European home, in which regular summit meetings and greatly increased contacts between people have become a permanent mechanism, is taking place before our very eyes. And even though the absurdity of the existence of nuclear weapons is obvious to all, recent debates within the NATO leadership have proved that they still feature in military-strategic plans.

Highly contradictory signals can be heard today from the ranks of the U.S. Administration. Readiness to discuss questions of arms reduction and limitation on the one hand, and a frank striving to preserve military superiority on the other hand. The latter was displayed, for example, in the question of reducing naval forces, where the United States enjoys a tangible advantage. U.S. State Department spokesperson M. Tutwiler declared last week that the United States is a maritime power and the Soviet Union is a land power, and therefore it is supposedly necessary to redress primarily the imbalance in ground forces in Europe. This indicates a blank spot, and not just in geographical knowledge...

Realism is an important element in the new political thinking and leads to a realization that, no matter how strong ideological differences might be, they should not affect international relations.

The new political thinking based on the realities of today's world has already devalued many postulates of the "cold war." Only incurable madmen can call today for crusades and the eradication of heresies on other people's territories. In our time, when people are becoming increasingly aware of the world's complex interdependence, it is no longer sufficient to simply live alongside each other in the world. Life itself and its complex global problems prompt states to cooperate.

People in the West are now discussing whether it is worth financing the economic reforms in the USSR and subsidizing perestroyka. Many have a sincere desire to help us, perceiving our country's policy as a guarantee of a better future for all peoples. There is a correct way of ensuring that both East and West are winners: Reduce the military burden and channel the funds thus released into peaceful purposes. Is this not attested by the example of the leaders of the USSR and Italy, who took major steps in the development of all-around cooperation, including in the sphere of military industry's conversion?

It is still too early to sum up the results of this year, which passed beneath the sign of Europe, but it can already be said that future historians will probably describe it as a watershed year. It does appear to be such a year in many respects. It is necessary to step up the Helsinki process against the background of swift changes, and conditions are now ripe to hold "Helsinki-2" as early as next year, consolidate everything positive that has been successfully achieved along the path to a safer and more humane world, and define the strategy for building it in the future. Let us hope that one of the last ice floes of the "cold war" has melted in the warm waters of the Mediterranean. The "cold war" era is receding into the past.

The new political thinking and universal human values cannot only be preached, they must be introduced in international relations right away, to the extent that circumstances permit. Politics is the art of the possible, including, as is becoming clear, even what seemed improbable only yesterday. Who could have expected that a storm on a scale unprecedented for decades would break off Malta during the Soviet-U.S. meeting. People heaved a sigh of relief on hearing that the USSR and U.S. leaders displayed staunchness and responsibility in order to continue their dialogue amid the raging elements and open a new page on which the history of a better world, of a world worthier of man, will be written.

We all can sense that the world is now moving more and more dynamically toward a new era, and its all-around perestroyka has begun.

Meeting Ends, Gorbachev Departs Valletta

LD0312161889 Moscow TASS in English 1600 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Valletta December 3 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

The Malta meeting of Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush is over. Following the joint news conference, Gorbachev went to the airport and left by air for Moscow.

In their press statements after the summit, the two presidents noted that its distinguishing features were a good atmosphere, openness and a broad exchange of opinions.

The sides achieved positive results both in discussing bilateral relations and examining major international issues.

Maltese Officials See Off Gorbachev

LD0312181589 Moscow TASS in English 1812 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Valletta December 3 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev left Malta's capital today upon the completion of his first summit meeting with U.S. President George Bush.

The state flags of the USSR and Malta were hoisted at the airport, and a guard of honour was mustered on the field.

Gorbachev was seen off by Malta's President Cencu Tabone and Prime Minister Edward Fenech Adami.

Gorbachev Returns to Moscow

LD0312210289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2000 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 3 December (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and USSR Supreme Soviet chariman, returned to Moscow today from the capital of Malta, where he took part in the Soviet-American summit meeting.

Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, returned with him.

Mikhail Gorbachev was met at the airport by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Lev Zaykov, Vladimir Kryuchkov, Yuriy Maslyukov, Vadim Medvedev, Nikolay Ryzhkov, and Nikolay Slyunkov, members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU: Aleksandra Biryukova, Aleksandr Vlasov, Anatoliy Lukyanov, Yevgeniy Primakov, Boris Pugo, Georgiy Razumovskiy, and Dmitriy Yazov, candidate members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU; Oleg Baklanov, Andrey Girenko, Yuriy Manayenkov, Yegor Stroyev, and Gumer Usmanov, secretaries of the Central Committee of the CPSU; and Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Among the welcoming party were F. Gietta and A. Muscat [names as received], the charges d'affaires in the USSR of Italy and Malta respectively.

Bush Departs Valletta for Brussels

LD0312161689 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Valletta December 3 TASS—After his Malta summit meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, U.S. President George Bush left for Brussels where he will inform NATO allies of the results of the Soviet-American talks.

In their press statements after the summit, Bush and Gorbachev noted that its distinguishing features were a good atmosphere, openness and a broad exchange of opinions.

The sides achieved positive results both in discussing bilateral relations and examining major international issues.

Bush Makes Brussels Arrival Statement

LD0412062589 Moscow TASS in English 0622 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels December 4 TASS—President George Bush arrived in Brussels on Sunday upon the completion of the unofficial Soviet-American off-Malta summit.

Bush will attend the NATO council session at the level of heads of state and government to open here on Monday.

The president will inform its participants on the results of the negotiations with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

In his brief statement at the airport, the president said that "much was accomplished to accelerate and improve East-West relations and I made it clear to Chairman Gorbachev that the United States supports fully his policy of perestroyka and I outlined steps we are prepared to take to demonstrate that support," the U.S. President said.

Bush said that Europe was now living through a period of profound changes and that much was yet to be done to overcome the division of Europe. "Today we stand at the crossroads of history on our way to a Europe made whole and free," Bush stressed. He noted that "NATO remains the bedrock of peaceful change in Europe."

Bush-Kohl Meeting, German Reunification Plan Noted

LD0312125289 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels December 3 TASS—President George Bush is expected to brief West German Chancellor Kohl on the Malta summit when he arrives in Brussels later today.

The two leaders will also discuss West German relations with the German Democratic Republic, officials say.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher will hold a separate meeting to discuss questions of mutual interest.

The sides will discuss the ten points of Chancellor Kohl's plan for relations between the two Germany's. West Germany's European partners have so far shown little enthusiasm for the plan.

Both London and Paris are cautious about German reunification within the context of changes currently sweeping Eastern Europe, and some political figures have clearly stated that the issue was not on the agenda.

The U.S. reaction was also skeptical.

Helmut Kohl is now scrambling to rally West Germany's NATO allies around his plan, and will seek support from President Bush, according to REUTERS.

Given the fact that many even in his native Germany are at loggerheads with his idea, Kohl faces an uphill battle.

Free Democrats who are included in Bonn's ruling coalition sided with Social Democrats and other opposition parties, saying they disgree with many points of the plan.

Genscher himself was quite critical on the eve of his meeting with Baker. Speaking in Zell, lower Saxony, at a meeting of ruling Free Democratic Party bodies, sometimes referred to as the party's mini-congress, Genscher pounded Kohl's plan as failing to guarantee the inviolability of Poland's borders.

The vagueness about the preservation of post-war borders undermines European stability and could thwart democratic reforms in Eastern Europe and progress in German-German relations, he said.

The solution of the "German question" can be found only within the common European process, he said.

The mini-congress produced an alternative to Kohl's plan and called to provide aid to the GDR with no strings attached and ensure the Polish right to "guaranteed" borders.

West Germany shall never make territorial claims on its neighbours, the new document said.

The ruling Christian Democratic Party is touting German unification in an attempt to woo electors in the run-up to next December's parliamentary elections.

Maltese Prime Minister Sees 'Era of Peace'

LD0412065789 Moscow TASS in English 0644 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Paris December 4 TASS—"This was undoubtedly a very important meeting. It signifies the beginning of a new era in East-West relations," Maltese Prime Minister Edward Fenech Adami told French television.

"When speaking to the two presidents on the eve of the meeting, I realised that during the summit the two sides would like to get guarantees that the cold war would end," he said.

"I believe that we are on the threshold of an era which, I hope, will be an era of peace," the prime minister said.

Baltic States Appeal to Bush, Gorbachev

LD0212173589 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] The meeting between the U.S. President George Bush and the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has drawn special attention of the Baltic people. Their ultimate goal is to press for the issue of the occupation and annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to be discussed during the meeting. [word indistinct] is contained in an appeal to the American and Soviet leaders and signed by the representatives of the Estonian and Latvian popular fronts and the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis.

The Baltic states [?are primarily concerned] with the loss of statehood, reads the appeal. This problem is not exclusively a domestic issue of the Soviet Union from the viewpoint of international law. Restoration of the Baltic states' independence complies with the Helsinki spirit and would be a factor stabilising [the] European situation. A letter of similar contents was forwarded to President George Bush by the Lithuanian opposition political parties and public organisations. The letter expresses gratitude to the American administration for the policy of non- recognition pursued in the course of 50 years and requests to deal with the restoration of Lithuania's independence during the talks with Mikhail Gorbachev.

Similar initiatives have been displayed by the emigre circles. In preparations for the meeting of the leaders of the two super powers the main Lithuanian emigration organisations - the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania, the World and American Lithuanian Communities, and the Lithuanian Americans' Council, issued an appeal urging Lithuanian Americans to address telegrams and letters to President George Bush requesting to raise during the meeting the issue of the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

As has been reported, the Lithuanian Franciscans, neighbours of the President's summer residence in the [words indistinct] were among the first to write a letter. All nations the world over, they write, aspire to freedom. So the Baltic states, too, want to regain their lost independence. President George Bush was addressed by Robert Kasten, senator from Wisconsin, [name indistinct] and 16 other senators. The letter asks the President to discuss the Baltic question during the meeting with the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. According to Senator Robert Kasten independence of the Baltic states would eventually serve good purpose for the Soviet and American interests and better relations between Washington and Moscow.

So, if not a clamour then at least a fuss has been raised around the Baltic states' independence. Perhaps this will have certain influence that the problem is not excluded

from the range of topics that the U.S. President termed as unexpected and not to be discussed in his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev.

The fact that [?from George Bush's political vocabulary] disappeared the word independence and was replaced by the concept self-determination while speaking of the Baltic states caused alarm in Lithuania. Hopefully the Baltic issue will not escape the President's range of (?vision).

Can anything like that be observed in Mikhail Gorbachev's stand? As is known, delayed by several months, the bill on the economic self-dependence of the Baltic states was at long last adopted at the recent session of the Soviet Parliament. Meanwhile, the latest news that reached us is rather encouraging. The Lithuanian representative in Washington and the Vatican, (?Stasislos Raitis), said that the Baltic diplomatic representatives in the United States yesterday met Robert (?Timmet), under secretary of state for political affairs, who reassured that the summit meeting in Malta would discuss the Baltic issue.

Intellectuals Send Message to Malta Meeting

LD0312103189 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Mexico City December 3 TASS—Participants in the fourth meeting of the "Issyk-Kul Forum", a free informal association of prominent figures of world science and culture, have sent the following message to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush:

"We, participants in the 4th annual Issyk-Kul Forum of world intellectuals, gathered in the capital of Mexico to discuss the burning problem of freedom of choice as a pre-condition for change, cordially greet the first Bush-Gorbachev summit in Malta.

"At a time when the world is changing dramatically and a new global relationship is emerging, fresh thinking on every subject—from international relations to environment, from technology to art, is crucial if the transition to tomorrow is to be peaceful and just. All our old prejudices, assumptions and institutions must be reconsidered.

"This is why the freedom to debate, discuss and dissent without fear is more necessary than ever.

"We recognise the enormous responsibilities you bear and are confident you will continue the efforts you have already made to guarantee this freedom in the spirit of peace and cooperation."

Spokesman on U.S. 'Interference' in Philippines

LD0112172389 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Reports from Manila say troops loyal to President Corazon Aquino have used the support by American aircraft to put down an Army mutiny. Some 30 officers and 370 men have been arrested. According to Mrs Aquino, the mutineers were still offering resistance in some places.

Meanwhile the Soviet parliament spokesman, Arkadiy Maslennikov, has criticized American interference in Filipino affairs. Speaking at a news conference in Malta, he said Soviet experience proved that any such interference was counterproductive.

U.S. Spokesman on Military Aid to Philippines

LD0112201689 Moscow TASS in English 2002 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 1 TASS—By TASS correspondent Stanislav Lunev:

Pentagon spokesman Pete Williams said here today that on the night between Thursday and Friday U.S. President George Bush gave orders to grant American military assistance to the Philippines in connection with the events in that country.

This decision was made by Bush after President Corazon Aquino of the Philippines requested the American side to blockade from the air two Philippine Air Force bases captured by mutineers led by cashiered Colonel Gregorio Honasan.

The U.S. President also gave orders to take measures to protect Americans living in that country.

The Pentagon spokesman noted that U.S. Vice-President Dan Quayle last night notified the Aquino government and the leaders of the U.S. Congress about the decision made by the President.

In compliance with the decision, a "small number" of F-4 Phantom fighter bombers stationed at the U.S. Clark Field Air Base began combat patrolling over the two Philippine air bases last night to prevent air attacks on Manila by planes of mutineers.

In addition, the spokesman said, about 100 marines were dispatched from the U.S. Subic Bay Base to reinforce the protection of the U.S. Embassy in Manila.

Williams noted that the Defence Department now has no reports on involvement of U.S. servicemen in combat operations between Philippine Government troops and mutineers.

He added that patrolling U.S. jets did not open fire on mutineers and did not intercept their planes.

According to U.S. press reports, over 40,000 u.s. troops, considerable numbers of warplanes, ships and other

military hardware are stationed at six U.S. military facilities in the Philippines, including the Subic Bay and Clark Field military bases, the largest in the South Pacific.

Soviet-U.S. Talks Held on Fighting Drug Abuse

LD0212134989 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—The Soviet Union and the U.S. expressed serious concern over the exacerbation of drug abuse in the world at consultations held on Thursday and Friday.

Delegations to the consultations, which aim to promote cooperation in combatting illicit drug trafficking and drug abuse, were led by Viktor Komplektov, Soviet deputy foreign minister, and Melvin Levitskiy, assistant to U.S. secretary of state.

The two sides noted the growing importance of joint Soviet-U.S. steps, in the context of international efforts, to prevent and curb the illicit production, distribution and use of drugs.

The sides examined in detail the progress of their cooperation, based on the memorandum on mutual understanding and cooperation to combat illicit drug trafficking that was signed by two governments in January 1989. They also discussed new prospects and areas for interaction. They agreed to study means to reduce leakage of precursor chemicals into the illegal market for use in the processing and manufacturing of illegal drugs.

They also discussed coordinating the countries' efforts in appropriate U.N. bodies and specialised agencies to enhance the efficiency of their work. Both sides stressed the importance of pooling efforts to combat drug abuse and emphasised the role of the forthcoming special session of the United Nations General Assembly on narcomania for the attainment of these goals.

The sides agreed to continue consultations at multilateral forums and to discuss political measures to reduce the flow of illegal drugs from the centers of drug production and trafficking.

USSR-U.S. Seminar on Cruise Missiles Opens

LD0212094189 Moscow TASS in English 0815 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 2 TASS—A scientific seminar began here on Friday to discuss the results of the joint Soviet-American experiment for the remote and contact control over the presence of sea-launched nuclear-tipped cruise missiles on ships.

The seminar is being attended by a group of scientists from the USSR Academy of Sciences and the I.V. Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy. The group is led by Academician Valeriy Barsukov.

The Soviet scientists are discussing the obtained results with the experts of the U.S. National Committee for the Protection of Natural Resources and are considering plans for further work in this respect.

China

Soviet-PRC Talks on Border Force Cuts Viewed

PM3011133989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] The first session of the Soviet-Chinese group of diplomatic and military experts was held 13 through 27 November in Moscow and discussed questions concerning the guiding principles of mutual armed forces reductions in the Soviet-Chinese border region and confidence-building in the military sphere. The Soviet section of the group is headed by G.V. Kireyev, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Asian Socialist Countries Administration, and the Chinese section by Liu Guangzhi, deputy chief of the PRC Foreign Ministry USSR and Eastern European Countries Department.

The sides expressed the common opinion that the reduction of the two countries' armed forces in the Soviet-Chinese border region and confidence-building efforts are of great importance for the development of relations of good-neighborliness and friendship between them.

The talks were held in a businesslike and constructive spirit.

The Chinese representatives had meetings with USSR Deputy Foreign Ministers V.P. Karpov and I.A. Rogachev in which Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, participated, and also a conversation with officials at the USSR Defense Ministry.

The sides agreed to continue the talks in Beijing.

Tian Jiyun Cited on Increased PRC-USSR Trade

LD1911143889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0200 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Beijing, 19 November (TASS)—In the last few years trade between China and the Soviet Union has been developing very quickly, and the sphere of bilateral economic cooperation is very wide. This was stressed by Tian Jiyun, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and vice-premier of the PRC's State Council, at a meeting with a delegation from the USSR Ministry of Trade, headed by the minister, K. Terekh, which took place here yesterday.

During the course of the conversation Tian Jiyun stated that the economies of both countries have both their strong and weak points. The presence of a large number of areas in which the PRC and the USSR could mutually exchange experience and copy positive aspects from each

other was noted. The deputy head of the Chinese Government also spoke in favor of using various forms of cooperation with the aim of further widening bilateral trade.

Tian Jiyun expressed confidence that given active cooperation by the appropriate departments in both countries, Sino-Soviet trade and economic relations would be raised to a new level.

PRC Economic, Agricultural Problems Noted

LD2411140589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 23 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Vladimir Kulikov, our Beijing correspondent, reports:

Cyclists and pedestrians have clothed themselves in warm jackets, mountains of autumn cabbage have appeared in the bazaars, and the owners of eating houses have put Beijing samovars and furniture outside the doors of their establishments. There is a bright sun over the ancient city. All the traditional signs of the Beijing autumn are present. [video shows city scenes]

This autumn has also made political amendments to the country's life. On the spot where I am now standing there was a military patrol implementing martial law in the city throughout the summer. The patrol has disappeared, just as the army has disappeared from the other main roads of Beijing, and as it has disappeared from Tiananmen Square. This happened somehow imperceptibly. Other problems and other issues are now agitating the people of Beijing. These are, above all, issues of the continuation of reform, economic issues. The overheating of the economy, the excessive pace of the development of capital construction, corruption, and other unhealthy phenomena, added to recently by economic sanctions on the part of some Western powers, have introduced certain difficulties into the country's economic and political life. [video shows Kulikov on a bridge over a major road, general street scenes]

China has an understanding attitude to these difficulties. Not for nothing was the saying: "If you plant a tree in the morning, don't think it will provide shade by noon" born here. People do not believe in easy success. The leadership has called on the people to meet the forthcoming years of economically tense life courageously. Calls for an economy drive and mobilization of internal reserves are heard. The tried-and-tested motto (zili gan shen), or "rely on your own strength," is again in fashion. Naturally, this does not cancel out one of the principles of the Chinese reform: openness to the outside world, the policy Deng Xiaoping actively advocated. [video shows more street scenes; Chinese newspapers, including one with a photograph of Deng meeting Nixon]

The patriarch of the Chinese revolution is entering this autumn as—in his own words—an ordinary citizen and pensioner. The fifth plenum of the CPC Central Committee, which took place a few days ago, satisfied his request to leave his supreme military posts. However, this did not create a sensation. The new leaders of the country confirmed their adherence to the policy of reforms, of which Deng Xiaoping was the architect. [video shows stills of Deng, alone and with family]

The problems worrying the Chinese leaders include the state of economic relations with the United States, and it is no coincidence that Nixon and Kissinger, the U.S. politicians who were at the source of the normalization of Sino-U.S. relations, were invited to Beijing recently. [video shows Chinese press photos of Deng meeting Nixon and Kissinger]

Nevertheless, the central problem today is the position of China's agriculture. Newspapers note that, as they hoped for the miracle-working strength of family contracting, many places overlooked such problems as capital investment in agriculture and its mechanization. In some places irrigation installations have begun to fall into decay, the policy of purchase prices has become clearly obsolete, and the gulf in revenue between poor and rich provinces has increased. The public, the country's leadership, and the mass media are now concentrating their attention on all these issues. [video shows Chinese television shots of farm scenes]

Northeast Asia

Japan Applauds Results of Malta Meeting

LD0412071189 Moscow TASS in English 0649 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo December 4 TASS—As a result of the Malta meeting between Presidents Gorbachev and Bush, a new era has opened up not only for relations between the two countries but for the whole world as well, a Japanese Foreign Ministry spokesman has said.

The unprecedented joint news conference by the two presidents, he said, became a reflection on the frankness of the talks. This constructive and frank dialogue will undoubtedly become a positive factor in world stability.

The spokesman voiced hope that the progress achieved at the summit as regards the talks on reducing strategic offensive arms and conventional arms in Europe would have a beneficial effect on efforts to maintain peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region.

Tikhonov Discusses Yakovlev's Visit to Japan

OW3011055489 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 28 Nov 89

[From the "Friendship and Goodneighborliness" program; announcer-read report on interview with Deputy Vladimir Tikhonov, member of the V.I. Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, chairman of the USSR Central Union of Consumer Cooperatives, and member of the

Yakovlev-led Supreme Soviet delegation that visited Japan, by Moscow Radio reporter Zubarev; recorded Tikhonov comments heard briefly in Russian fading into Japanese translation by male announcer]

[Text] As Radio Moscow has reported many times, a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by Yakovlev, Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee, has returned to the Soviet Union after winding up a week-long visit to Japan. Radio Moscow reporter Zubarev interviewed Deputy Vladimir Tikhonov, a member of the delegation. Deputy Tikhonov is a member of the V.I. Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences and also chairman of the USSR Central Union of Consumer Cooperatives. Deputy Tikhonov accepted reporter Zubarev's interview for Radio Moscow listeners. Please listen to the contents of the interview.

[Zubarev] Here is the first question. Japanese and Soviet mass media showed a great interest in the Supreme Soviet delegation's Japan tour. What do you think was the reason?

[Tikhonov] Perhaps people in Japanese business circles understand very well that under the present situation it will be very difficult for them to live peacefully unless they build up firm ties with their neighboring nation, the Soviet Union. Yet, perestroyka promises to lead the Soviet Union to the level of advanced countries not only in the fields of defense and heavy industry but also in all other fields that are necessary for living. This is one of the reasons that a great interest was shown in our visit to Japan.

[Zubarev] Has the Japanese side begun to have a more serious understanding of the present status of the USSR Supreme Soviet?

[Tikhonov] I think that, undoubtedly, most people suddenly noticed and were surprised by the existence of a so-called congress in the Soviet Union. The Soviet congress is freer and more democratic than the parliaments in Europe. More heated debates are exchanged there on various issues. All these things were viewed by all nations in the world, including Japan, with surprised eyes. Needless to say, great attention and respect was paid to members of the Soviet Congress.

[Zubarev] Personally, what did you expect from the visit and was it as you had expected?

[Tikhonov] I have been stating that the peace treaty issue would be a central issue to arouse the interest of the politicians. Almost 45 years have passed since the war ended. During the period we established normal diplomatic relations and also opened and are expanding trade relations with Japan. This notwithstanding, a peace treaty has not yet been concluded with Japan. I cannot help but say that this is utterly abnormal. It is as clear as day that neither Japan nor the Soviet side intend to wage a war. Nevertheless, a peace treaty has not yet been concluded between us. How ridiculous this is. As a matter of course, this is the primary issue arousing the Japanese people's interest. This is why Mr Yakovlev, who is regarded by the Japanese as General Secretary Gorbachev's right arm, visited Japan.

In fact, Mr Yakovlev arrived in Japan with a formula which, in my opinion, is very prudent. Believing it is necessary to conclude a peace treaty at the earliest possible date, Mr Yakovlev sought a variety of options for concluding the peace treaty in cooperation with the Japanese side and proposed to seek "a third way" for solving all urgent problems, including the issue of the four Kuril Islands. In outline, Mr Yakovlev stated as follows: Japan wishes to secure the Kuril Islands. This is natural. However, we do not want to concede the four islands, nor is there any reason why we should concede them. Both sides have their say on the question of jurisdiction over the four Kuril Islands.

At present, the positions of the two sides conflict with each other. However, the Soviet side agrees that we should seek a way out of this situation. In short, we should seek a way of solving the problem without impairing the rights of the people of both countries. What measures are available for solving the problem? The answer is to build truly good-neighborly relations through expanding political, economic, and cultural relations between the two countries. In the process of promoting such relations, the Kuril Islands issue will be spontaneously solved. This issue cannot remain unresolved. Mr Yakovlev argued this way. Personally, I also believe that it is possible to find a way of solving this pending problem and concluding a peace treaty between our two countries.

[Zubarev] How do you think the Japanese side received this idea?

[Tikhonov] First, this argument on the issue made the Japanese understand that the Soviet Union is seeking some sort of option acceptable to both sides. Second, it made the Japanese side consider what the third way, or the third measure, means and in which direction we must head to tread this third way. I think this is the most carefully thought-out approach at the present moment. However, we also should think of materializing this as soon as possible. Regarding this question, more concrete proposals and initiatives will be spelled out by the time General Secretary Gorbachev visits Japan. This is naturally the way it should be, and there should be no other way because both the Soviet Union and Japan are interested in keeping friendly relations and promoting cooperative relations based on mutual understanding.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Coup Attempt Against Philippines' Aquino Reported

Military Disillusionment Seen as Factor

HK0212083089 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Another coup d'etat has taken place in the Philippines. According to reports, this is the sixth coup

attempt against the Aquino government since it was installed in 1986 by means of People's Power. It will be recalled that it was also the military that placed President Aquino in power after the snap presidential election in 1986. This was after a group of soldiers and the former Minister of Defense Juan Ponce Enrile, who is now a senator, declared the results of the national election fraudulent, for which President Ferdinand Marcos, who is now dead, was responsible. This declaration by Enrile and his aide Gregorio Honasan was backed up by the Filipinos, who paved the way for Mrs Aquino, Marcos' opponent, to be installed as president that year.

However, relations between President Aquino and some sectors in the military have become complicated, with Aquino going against military advice on several delicate issues, particularly involving decisions which were opposed by the military. Reports say this is one reason one sector of the military has become disenchanted with the Aquino government and joined the rebels.

The bloodiest coup was the one led by Gringo Honasan in August 1987, when about 200 of his supporters attacked Malacanang and military installations in Manila. Other reports say that the Honasan and Reynaldo Cabauatan group still has supporters in various regions of the country.

The coup was thwarted; however, Honasan eluded the authorities. Manila newspapers reported that he boarded an American helicopter which came from their military bases. Ever since then, Honasan has remained underground and has continued to oppose the Aquino government, demanding that President Aquino reshuffle her Cabinet which, according to the military, has some leftist members.

The latest coup d'etat is reported to be headed by someone named Lieutenant Colonel Gojo, a relative of Honasan's. It was reported that before the coup began, Honasan was seen speaking to the coup leaders. As of now, the motives behind this coup are still not clear, but the military is known to be upset that the Aquino government was dismantling the Philippine Constabulary to make it part of the country's police. Consequently, the men who were reshuffled joined the group that is demanding reforms in the defense establishment besides opposing the Aquino Government. These men also criticize President Aquino for failing to solve the main problems which the Philippines faces.

So what becomes clear in all this are the personal ambitions of top officials in the Philippines' armed forces, as well as the fact that they have been flaunting their education and military training in the United States.

Aquino Asks U.S. for Help

HK0212102489 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] The situation in the Philippines remains tense as a result of the coup d'etat mounted in Manila by the Philippine Marines. According to reports, President Corazon Aquino formally asked the United States for help after Malacanang was bombed. Consequently, U.S. President George Bush allowed American armed forces stationed in the Philippines to assist troops of the Aquino Government in crushing the rebels. At present, U.S. fighter planes are helping the Philippine Armed Forces, and President Aquino is reported to have left Malacanang and is safe.

According to Aquino's first statement over television, all commanders of the Philippine Armed Forces were supporting her. Defense Secretary Ramos said it would just be a matter of hours before the coup d'etat is suppressed. Meanwhile all roads leading into Manila have been blocked by government troops.

Aquino Says Coup Attempt Thwarted

LD0112105989 Moscow TASS in English 0913 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Manila December 1 TASS—Philippine President Corazon Aquino has said in a TV address that government forces have thwarted the coup attempt.

The situation in the country is under the complete control of loyal government forces, she said.

Commanders of all armed services sided with the government, Aquino said, calling on her people and soldiers to protect democracy.

The situation is calm elsewhere in the Philippines and no anti-government actions have been reported, Parliamentary speaker Ramon Mitra said over TV.

Streets leading to the Presidential Palace in Manila are patrolled by the army. Civilians have been told to stay home since some rebel groups are still active. Schools canceled classes today.

Meanwhile, the rebels attacked government garrisons, REUTER reported. Rebel helicopters opened fire at the Constabulary headquarters, and Camp Crame and Camp Aquinaldo military bases.

At least six people have died in clashes in Manila, according to preliminary estimates.

U.S. 'Interference' Criticized

PM0112165189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent D. Kosyrev dispatch, Leonid Kuznetsov "Observer's Opinion," and REUTER dispatch under general heading: "Attempted Coup"]

[Excerpts] Manila, 1 Dec—As I dictate these lines, Philippines Television, back on the air after a lengthy break, is broadcasting a press conference by President C. Aquino. She began by declaring that the country's Defense Minister F. Ramos has, on her orders, asked the United States for help. U.S. aircraft stationed at the U.S.

Air Force Base at Clark Field have been scrambled. A couple of fighters are roaring past at low altitude before coming in for a fresh run. This has clearly tilted the scales in favor of the government troops, but the situation remains unclear. [passage omitted]

Observer's Opinion

One point about the reports from Manila is worrying—U.S. Armed Forces are taking part in suppressing the attempted revolt.

Hitherto, even at the most critical moments, C. Aquino's administration has always managed by itself and has successfully put down five right-wing military revolts. Why is it forced to resort to aid from foreign soldiers today?

The opponents of detente and bellicose militarist circles across the ocean have long been seeking a pretext to ensure active and broad interference in the Philippines' internal affairs by relying on domestic reaction, primarily in the Armed Forces, as a last resort. They are primarily worried by the fact that a movement against the U.S. military presence is swelling in the archipelago, and its members are advocating the elimination of U.S. bases or at least the establishment of some control over their "nuclear ambitions."

In response to these justified demands, the Pentagon resorted to sundry maneuvers—from blackmail using the "Soviet military threat" to promises to "slam the door" and move its bases somewhere else in the region (Singapore, for example), thus sharply aggravating the country's economic position. But the Filipinos did not react to these maneuvers the way the militarists expected. Moreover, they are continuing to insist that they must reserve the right to find a solution to the bases question that best suits the nation when the U.S.-Philippines agreement runs out.

The following conclusions come to mind in this context: Even if the omnipresent CIA agents did not participate in elaborating the coup plans, they probably knew about them. But they did not inform the Aquino administration of this. Why? It is not hard to guess. By helping the President to put down this action by the regime's opponents, the Americans are demonstrating the [Philippine] administration's weakness and are forcing it to be more amenable at the talks on the bases. It should also be grateful that the threat of a coup has been eliminated. The main point is that it should realize that the Philippines cannot manage without a U.S. military presence. After all, interference in other countries' internal affairs can take different forms. Including such "noble" ones... [passage omitted]

Near East & South Asia

Abalkin, Afghan Premier Discuss Economic Ties

LD0112141189 Moscow TASS in English 1326 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Lev Abalkin today received Sultan Ali Keshtmand, chairman of the Executive Committee of Afghanistan's Council of Ministers. They exchanged views on Soviet-Afghan economic cooperation and prospects of its development. The meeting was attended by First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov.

Supreme Soviet's Masaliyev Visiting Syria

Meets Assembly Head, Foreign Minister

PM0112120189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Kozhevnikov and TASS correspondent V. Shchennikov dispatch: "Meetings in the Syrian Parliament"]

[Text] Damascus—The Soviet parliamentary delegation headed by A.M. Masaliyev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and member of the CPSU Central Committee, was received by 'Abd al-Qadir Qaddurah, speaker of the Syrian Arab Republic People's Assembly.

Welcoming the Soviet guests, he noted the great importance Syria attaches to the visit by the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, which is taking place within the framework of regular contacts between representatives of the Syrian People's Assembly and the USSR Supreme Soviet. Each of these meetings, he noted, whether held in Moscow or Damascus, serves the cause of developing and deepening the relations of friendship and cooperation between our countries' peoples.

Soviet delegation head A.M. Masaliyev expressed thanks for the invitation to visit Syria and for the warmth, cordiality, and heartfelt welcome extended to the Soviet delegation ever since its arrival in the hospitable Syrian land.

Political cooperation between the Soviet Union and Syria is distinguished by their community of interests in the main issues of our time and their mutual openness for businesslike and constructive discussion of topical problems of international life and bilateral cooperation. An important role in this process is played by summit meetings and talks, which are always characterized by an atmosphere of comradeship and mutual trust. This sound tradition is followed in contacts between the two heads of state—Comrades M.S. Gorbachev and H. al-Asad—that always produce fruitful results.

I hope, A.M. Masaliyev noted, that this visit will not only serve to further develop cooperation between the two

countries' supreme organs of power, but will also make a practical contribution to strengthening of Soviet-Syrian collaboration in international affairs.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation then met with Syrian Foreign Minister F. al-Shar'. During the conversation, which proceeded in a frank and friendly atmosphere, they touched on questions of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and the Syrian Arab Republic, the situation in the world and the Near East region, and several problems of mutual interest.

Visits Hydrotechnical Complex, Halab

LD0212113589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0902 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Damascus, 1 Dec (TASS)—The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit to the Syrian Arab Republic, led by A.M. Masaliyev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, first secretary of the Kirghizia Communist Party Central Committee, and member of the CPSU Central Committee, is continuing. They were introduced to the Euphrates Hydrotechnical Complex, which was built by Syrian workers, engineers, and technicians with economic and technical assistance from the Soviet Union. The delegation members viewed the "symbol of Syrian-Soviet friendship"—as this "power heart of Syria" has been called by President H. al-Asad—and visited the town of Al-Sawrah [name as received], where Syrian and Soviet construction and maintainance workers live and work. They met and talked with the collective of Soviet specialists.

During its stay in the city of Halab, the Soviet parliamentary group was acquainted with the sights in the city, and spoke about the historic changes taking place in the socioeconomic and political life of our country.

The governor of the Halab Province gave a dinner in honor of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation at which both sides made speeches.

Received by President Al-Asad

LD0312103289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0843 GMT 3 Dec 89

(Text] Damascus, 3 Dec (TASS)—Yesterday Hafiz al-Asad, secretary general of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party and president of the Syrian Arab Republic, received a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by A.M. Masaliyev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Kirghizia CP and a member of the CPSU Central Committee. The head of the Soviet delegation delivered a message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the Syrian president.

There was a conversation during which the successful development of multifaceted relations between the Soviet Union and Syria was noted with satisfaction. Stress was laid on the topical nature of actions and dialogue aimed at seeking solutions that are mutually acceptable to all sides involved during an exchange of views on the problems concerning the situation in the region and throughout the world. The conviction was expressed of the need to increase reciprocal efforts in the process of preparing to convene an international conference on the Near East under the aegis of the United Nations as soon as possible.

The delegation also met yesterday with Syria's prime minister, Mahmud al-Zu'bi. It was noted at the meeting that the development of multifaceted relations between the Soviet Union and the Syrian Arab Republic corresponds to the fundamental interests of the peoples of both countries.

Israeli Agriculture Minister Interviewed on Visit

LD0212181589 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov:

Israel is interested in exporting its agricultural products to the Soviet Union, Israeli Agriculture Minister Avraham Katz-'oz told TASS.

The minister, in the USSR at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said the delegation came to the Soviet Union to study the Soviet domestic market. Israel, he said, exports its products to many European countries, including socialist ones. He said he saw no reason why its agricultural products should not have access to the shelves in Soviet shops.

The second aim of the visit is to set up joint ventures on a counter trade basis, Katz-'oz continued. Israel has considerable experience in creating farms to produce meat, milk and grow chickens. It wants to share its experience in this field with the Soviet Union. In return, Israel could receive timber, cotton and rolled stock—everything the Soviet side can offer.

The minister also said Israel would like to share its expertise in growing vegetables and fruit in dry zones and on salined soil.

Katz-'oz described the delegation's visit to the Soviet Union as a first step towards developing economic relations between the two countries and said he was warmly received in the USSR.

"No matter where we stayed or with whom we talked, we felt interest, openness and friendliness," he said.

UN Discussion on Palestine Ends 1 Dec

LD0212181189 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] New York December 2 TASS—By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov:

The United Nations General Assembly finished discussing the Palestinian issue on Friday [1 December]. The discussion came at a key moment for the Palestinian people and the whole Middle East.

Practically all the speakers noted that a sufficiently broad political base has recently been created to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict peacefully.

Its key elements are the readiness of the PLO to negotiate with Israel within the framework of an international conference and on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338 of the UN Security Council, the desire of the Palestinian people to coexist with Israel in peace and security, and broad-based support of the proposal to convene an international conference with participation of all parties concerned and five permanent members of the UN security committee under the UN aegis.

However, the Israeli representative conveyed at the session the rather tough stand of the Israeli leadership as regards the settlement, proving that the revaluation of old approaches is slow to come in Tel Aviv.

His speech also testified Israel's refusal to start a dialogue with the PLO and desire to find an alternative partner for negotiations on elections in the occupied Palestinian territories.

Speaking on behalf of the 12 member-countries of the European Economic Communities, the French representative noted that any settlement of the problem should be based on the principle "territories for peace," as well as on Security Council resolutions.

All parties concerned, including the PLO, must participate in the conference on the Middle East, he added.

Conveying the U.S. stand, the United States representative said that free and just elections offer a concrete way to stop the confrontation between the Israelis and Palestinians.

However, he did not mention the PLO, or the international peace conference on the Middle East or possible assistance to the settlement by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council.

The U.S. representative spoke only of U.S. efforts to organise an Israeli-Palestinian dialogue to discuss the elections proposal.

Speaking about the elections, the Soviet permanent representative to the UN Alexander Belonogov pointed out that elections have a rather powerful potential that is capable of promoting the practical implementation of the settlement.

There are other possibilities. But one should not forget about the major factor—the extent to which the chosen path corresponds to the achievement of a comprehensive settlement and the convocation of an international conference with this aim.

Voting on the submitted draft resolutions on Palestine will be held on Monday [4 December].

Supreme Soviet Cables 'Arafat on 'Solidarity' Day

LD2911180789 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 29 Nov 89

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium addressed a congratulations cable to Yasir 'Arafat, head of the Palestinian State and chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, on the occasion of the international day of solidarity with the Palestinian people. The cable included:

On the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people, we send the most sincere congratulations and wishes of success of the struggle for their legitimate national rights to the PLO and through it to all Palestinians.

Establishing a stable and firm peace in the Middle East conforms to the deep interests of the Palestinian people and the other peoples of the Middle East. Because of its constructive and realistic course, the PLO, at the 19th Palestine National Congress session, drew up suitable introductions for settling the Middle East conflict and for a just solution to the Palestinian issue which were compatible with the changes in the international situation.

The extent of the mass movement in the occupied territories show the high standard of the national consciousness of the Palestinian people and their commitment to working for the fulfilment of their rights to a free and independent development.

Today we can confidently point out the fact that the uprising has become a powerful factor in influencing the situation in the region and beyond its borders, and that it enjoys the sympathies of many peoples in the world.

The cable goes on:

The Soviet Union always supports the PLO; and its efforts are aimed at solving the Arab-Israeli conflict by political means on the basis of a balance of the interests of all the sides involved in the conflict.

The international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of the PLO, which is called for by the overwhelming majority of the countries of the world is recognized by everyone as a legitimate international mechanism.

We reiterate our solidarity with the friendly Palestinian people and we wish the Palestinian people success in the struggle for self-determination and for the fulfilment of their national aspirations.

Moves Toward Formation of Indian Government Noted

PM0112164589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent N. Paklin dispatch: "India: Resignation of the Prime Minister"; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Excerpts] India's Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi submitted his government's resignation to President Ramaswamy Venkataraman. The president asked the prime minister to continue performing his functions until an alternative government is formed, TASS reported on 29 November.

Here are some details about events in India reported by N. Paklin, our correspondent in Delhi. [passage omitted]

Of course, the causes of the failure by the Indian National Congress-Indira Party [INC-I] have yet to be analyzed. It can be said right away, however, that a by no means insignificant role was played by the rising prices, inflation, and mass unemployment with which the INC-I failed to cope despite all its efforts, as well as by splits within the party itself.

The initial election results were hardly announced before leaders of the opposition parties urgently embarked on consultations about forming a new government. This is not an easy task. Even during the elections the communists declared their firm refusal to take part in a future government if it were to include representatives of the Bharatiya Janata Party [BJP]. The BJP leadership is adopting exactly the same attitude toward the left-wing parties. But the National Front will be unable to form a government unless they both support it.

New Prime Minister Sworn In

LD0212143889 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] New Delhi December 2 TASS—Vishwanath Pratap Singh was sworn in today as prime minister of India. The ceremony, administered by President Ramaswamy Venkataraman, was attended by major politicians of India, including Rajiv Gandhi, chairman of the Indian National Congress [INC] (I) party which is now in opposition. Devi Lal, a prominent leader of the National Front who was named deputy prime minister, also took the oath.

It is the first time that a minority coalition government will be formed in India. The coalition is led by V.P. Singh, leader of the National Front alliance in the Parliament and chairman of the Janata Dal Party.

No political party managed to win a majority during last month's elections to the People's (Lower) Chamber of the Indian Parliament. President Venkataraman asked the National Front to form a new government because the latter enjoyed the support of left-wing forces and right-wing Bharatiya Janata Party. The INC (I) party, which has been voted out of office, has the largest number of seats in the lower chamber. The new government has 30 days to secure a vote of confidence in the Parliament.

Iranian Deputy on Iran-Soviet Armenia Ties

NC2411094689 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Yerevan, 22 Nov (ARMENPRES)—Artavaz Baqumian, Iranian parliamentary representative of the southern Armenians in Iran, recently visited Soviet Armenia with his family and said the following to an ARMENPRES correspondent: "The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] problem is so simple and comprehensible that the hypocrisy of the Azerbaijan leadership on the issue cannot hide the obvious facts. No matter how they try to avoid it, they will eventually have to accept the truth. History will bring everything to the surface." [passage omitted]

He added: During my stay in Armenia I met with many people including the chairman of the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet. Nowadays their attention centers on two problems: the just struggle of the people of the NKAO and elimination of earthquake damage.

Baqumian said: Regarding the second issue, I want to say that preparatory work is under way to establish economic relations between Iran and Soviet Armenia. I think that the visit of Iranian President Rafsanjani to the Soviet Union and his meeting with Gorbachev will play a role in this endeavor. [passage omitted]

Sub-Saharan Africa

U.S. Aid to Angolan Rebels Criticized

LD0212060889 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] A plane of the United States Central Intelligence Agency carrying weapons for the anti-Angolan UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] group crashed recently in southern Angola. Vladimir Valentinov comments.

There is unfortunately nothing sensational about an aircraft disaster in our time, and a plane crash in the south of Angola would hardly have rated such attention had it not been for certain details. After taking off from Kamina Airbase in Zaire, the American plane violated the airspace of a sovereign state. Besides, the plane was carrying a big consignment of weapons for UNITA, a group that still sows death and destruction in Angola. This fact is tangible proof that the United States is flagrantly interfering in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola.

Other sources revealed that this year United States assistance to UNITA rose from $15 to $50 million. Those circumstances have shattered all hope that the United States would discontinue assistance to UNITA and would honour its commitments under the New York

agreement on a settlement in Southwest Africa, as the other parties to the agreement—Angola and Cuba—are doing. This last, incidentally, was put on record by the American representative during the latest session of the joint commission monitoring the settlement in Southwest Africa.

Against this background there is something very strange about the letter of a group of United States senators addressed to the President George Bush, which charges that the Angolan leadership is putting up barriers to the peace settlement. How then are we to view the Luanda peace plan, which found the approval of all the member-states of the Organization of African Unity? Angola persists to this day in its search for peace for the region and for the continent. But that does not carry weight with the American senators. They want the American and Soviet leaders at their summit off the shore of Malta to pressure the Government of Angola into accepting the UNITA cease-fire plan, an impossible (?demarche), seeing that it has already been turned down by the legitimate Government of Angola. What is behind all those demands? A bid to derail the peace settlement in Angola? A wish to do UNITA a service in return for $2 million it spends annually on its lobby in Congress? Perhaps both.

The Angolan ANGOP news agency believes that the appeal of the American senators is nothing but a bid by the United States to accuse the Angolan Government of barring negotiations on a peace settlement. Those who are really to blame for wrecking efforts to reinstate peace in the country want the world public to believe that they are being victimized by the Angolan irreconcilables. Meanwhile, the stance of the Angolan Government on the peace settlement is quite clearly spelt out in international documents. Angola opposes any and all interference in domestic affairs. It protests against false charges by the United States senators and the supplies of weapons to UNITA.

RSA's De Klerk Praised for Reining in Army

MB0112104989 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 30 Nov 89

[From the "South Africa Today" program; Aleksandr Fedorov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] The intentions of the South African president are not sensational.

This should have happened sooner or later. The race between the followers of Pieter Botha before his resignation allowed De Klerk to see the potential of each rival. The most dangerous of them was Defense Minister Magnus Malan, who enjoyed the support of both the army and the police, as well as of the part of the white community that does not approve deviations from the policy of apartheid.

It seemed, too, that after the parliamentary elections of 6 September, there were two presidents in the country: legally elected Frederik de Klerk, promising revolutionary changes, and Magnus Malan, who was left behind in the marathon but hoped to win in the end.

Sometimes it seems that the defense minister has greater power. South Africa is still looking for the officer who provided the authorities with the false information about alleged concentration of SWAPO [South-West African People's Organization] fighters in Namibia.

The military actively cooperates with the death squads, thus encouraging the tribalist African organization, Inkatha, to clash with opponents through apartheid. All this does not promote the authority of the new president (?because) South Africa and the rest of the world expect so much.

The statement of the president about the role of the army was quite clear. The military, who have always been in government cabinets, as well as the corridors of power, should (?move) out.

I think that De Klerk reaffirmed his reputation as a good strategist who does not attack blindly but waits for a suitable moment for delivering the blow, and the moment has come.

Today, Magnus Malan can count only on the Conservative Party [CP], losing its popularity, and the unpopular Afrikaner resistance movement. It's (?arrogant) for many people of South Africa that the unlimited power of the military complained of the reforms and the improvement of relations between neighboring countries. [sentence as heard]

Adamantly, the president also had in mind the fact that knowledge will surface in connection with the financial machinations and tax evasions by his friend, a prominent industrialist, Albert Vermaas. It's not important whether that is part of the rivalry among the leaders or a distant echo of election battles; no doubt that it is a positive development that the (?army) has been pushed back.

The military have always been the pillar of apartheid. All their actions are directly or indirectly linked to the protection of a system of separate development. Suffice it to recall Malan's orders to follow in the footsteps, the footsteps [word indistinct] the countries where leaders criticize apartheid.

It was primarily due to the South African Army that the UN Security Council Resolution 435 on Namibia was not carried out for decades. Often, the military provoked the peaceful demonstrations of Africans in order to improve the need for the continuation of the state of emergency. By trying to put the military in their place, the South African president took the most important step of his presidency, but I won't be surprised if the general opened another front against him on the pretext that the CP demands the protection of the country of milk and honey from the African National Congress. The militance of using [Afrikaner Resistance Movement

leader Eugene] Terreblanche, claiming that the army has thousands of supporters of the Afrikaner Resistance Movement, can find many other pretexts.

It's reassuring that those who grab at guns in any circumstances do not enjoy great authority.

We live in reassuring times, and South African is beginning to realize that it is time to return to the world community, and one can enter it with peaceful intentions, not weapons.

Supreme Soviet Group's Djibouti Visit Statement

PM3011164789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

["Joint Soviet-Djiboutian Announcement on a USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation's Visit to the Republic of Djibouti"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by M.R. Sagdiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, was in the Republic of Djibouti 21-24 November on an official visit at the invitation of that country's national assembly [title of Djibouti Chamber of Deputies as published]. The delegation was received by Hassan Gouled Aptidon, president of the Republic of Djibouti. Talks were held with Prime Minister Barkat Gourad Hamadan, national assembly President Abdulkader Waberi Askar, and Foreign Affairs and Cooperation Minister Moumin Bahdon Farah, and meetings were held with national assembly deputies.

During the meetings and talks, which took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, the sides informed each other about topical questions in the internal life of their states. The Soviet parliamentarians spoke in detail about the progress of perestroyka in the USSR and the basic trends in the economic and political reform, including reform in the sphere of state building. The Soviet guests devoted attention to questions of the USSR Supreme Soviet's work and the progress of its session. The Djibouti side spoke about the republic National Assembly's activity and the steps taken to solve socio-economic problems.

The sides expressed close evaluations of the current international situation. The interlocutors stressed the need to strengthen the positive trends outlined in its development and the importance of assistance in this from all countries—both large and small. The conviction was expressed that there is a need to development collaboration between the USSR and Djibouti in the international arena in accordance with the universal rules of peaceful cohabitation [obshchezhitiye], with the aim of strengthening international security and disarmament and strengthening trust and cooperation between states.

An important contribution can be made to resolving these tasks, the parliamentarians noted, by creating nuclear-free zones and peace zones in various areas of the world, including Africa, as well as by removing sources of regional conflict by political means.

The participants in the talks advocated the continuation of efforts to create stability, good-neighborliness, and cooperation in the Horn of Africa—something that is bound to be promoted if all states located there and all other interested parties observe the principles of respect for sovereignty, autonomy, and territorial integrity.

In examining the situation in the Near East, the parliamentarians expressed anxiety about the continuing tension in this region, which in their opinion is having an effect on the international situation as a whole. The sides resolutely condemned the murder of the Lebanese president, who was lawfully elected by representatives of the Lebanese people.

The sides believe that the problems in the Near East cannot be resolved by violence and pressure. They are profoundly convinced that the convening of an international conference under UN auspices with the participation of all interested parties, including the lawful representatives of the Palestinian people as well as the five permanent members of the Security Council, will be an acceptable way of establishing justice and an all-embracing peace in the Near East.

The sides announced their solidarity with the just struggle of South African democratic forces to dismantle the apartheid system, support the efforts of "frontline" states aimed at turning the southern African region into an area of peace and stability, and stressed the need to implement the UN plan for Namibia in full and within the set time limit.

The talks that were held confirmed the desire of the USSR and Djibouti for the further strengthening of ties, including ties between the two countries' parliaments. The Supreme Soviet delegation expressed gratitude for the warm reception it had been given and invited a delegation from the Republic of Djibouti national assembly to come to the Soviet Union on an official visit.

East Europe

GDR Communists Demand Politburo Resignation

LD0312110489 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 3 TASS—Thousands of rank-and-file communists from Berlin and other cities protested against top level corruption and abuse of power in the German Democratic Republic on Saturday.

At a rally in front of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee headquarters, protesters demanded the immediate resignation of the ruling Politburo and said the party Central Committee did not represent the interests of ordinary party members, the ADN news agency reported.

The meeting was organised by the Prenzlauer Berg District party organisation in an effort to rally communists around the party.

Demonstrators demanded the setting up of a working secretariat to serve as a caretaker body before a new party congress elects new leaders.

The protesters denounced the current party leadership, which they said hesitated to take resolute action to punish former party leaders for their crimes.

GDR leader Egon krenz told the rally he was prepared to take the responsibility and would raise the matter at today's party plenum.

"I regard corruption and abuse of power as incompatible with Communist membership," Krenz said.

He also called on the Socialist Unity Party to unite to prevent a rift.

Many of those who spoke at the rally arrived after taking part in district party conferences. They said communists want only consistent supporters of renewal in the party to represent them at the congress.

Only people with a clear conscience can be party members, they said. The party shall defend workers' interests and preserve the communist and Social Democratic legacy.

Protesters threatened to demonstrate again if the Politburo does not resign at today's plenum.

SED Central Committee Resigns; Honecker Expelled

LD0312162389 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 3 TASS—The entire Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG) [SED] announced its resignation at a special plenary meeting of the party's Central Committee which opened here today.

A working commission was set up to prepare for a special SUPG congress. Several members of the former party leadership, including Erich Honecker, Willi Stoph and Horst Sindermann were expelled from the SUPG Central Committee and the party.

Former SED Leaders Mittag, Tisch Arrested

LD0312143589 Moscow TASS in English 1413 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Mikhail Voronenkov:

The prosecutor-general of the German Democratic Republic authorised the arrest of Guenter Mittag, former secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) Central Committee, and Harry Tisch, former chairman of the organisation of Free German Trade Unions (FDGB), the ADN news agency reported today.

They are now in custody pending charges of doing great damage to national property and the country's economy through abuse of power.

Gerhard Mueller, former leader of the SED District Committee of Erfurt, has also been arrested on the same grounds, the prosecutor-general announced.

SED Leading Role Omitted From Constitution

LD0212212289 Moscow TASS in English 2032 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 2 TASS—By TASS correspondents Konstantin Savvin and Vadim Chudov:

The 13th session of the GDR parliament amended the first article of the GDR Constitution today by an overwhelming majority with five abstaining.

The amendment excluded the article's provision on the leading role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party in the country's life.

Speaking in debates, deputies noted that this provision does not any longer correspond to the current situation in the German Democratic Republic, and, in particular, to the fact that peasants, craftsmen and intellectuals, who are members of other parties and public organisations, actively participate along with workers in restructuring society.

In this connection, the speakers also noted that the recently forged government is a coalition one, which included representatives of five parties, comprising the central democratic bloc.

Deputies then discussed the draft law on foreign trips of East German citizens. The draft law was adopted in the first reading and submitted for consideration to parliamentary commissions. Until the law is adopted, a resolution of the Council of Ministers of November 9 on foreign trip procedure will be in effect.

The parliament also heard the report of the interim parliamentary commission chairman Heinrich Teplitz on results of investigation into cases of power abuse, corruption and personal enrichment.

Teplitz cited numerous facts of corruption and former party and state leaders exploiting their position for personal benefit. He demanded that the culprits were made answer and proposed to set up similar commissions at local authority bodies to identify and investigate into these cases.

Speaking at the session, chairman of the State Council Egon Krenz said that political blunders made by the previous leadership led the country into a severe political crisis. The party takes the responsibility for it, he stressed.

However, it is necessary to differentiate between political mistakes and crimes. While the latter is to be investigated, the mistakes must be studied to find out whether they were made consciously. A mechanism should be created to prevent the repetition of mistakes.

A major cause of the current crisis situation is the fact that the party failed to make conclusions from Soviet perestroyka, Krenz said. Meanwhile, the questions put by Soviet Communists back in 1985 were topical for the German party as well.

The country's Prime Minister Hans Modrow assured the deputies that the GDR Government will draw appropriate conclusions from critical remarks of working people and take resolute measures to overcome the crisis situation in the country.

Confidence may be lost within minutes, but it will take months or, sometimes, years to restore it, he stressed. Modrow called upon the population to join their efforts and stabilise the situation in the country.

The parliament adopted an appeal to the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly and the Czechoslovak people, in which [it] expressed its regret with the GDR participation in military actions of the Warsaw Treaty member-states in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and apologized to the Czechoslovak people for these actions.

GDR Apologizes to CSSR for 1968 Invasion Role

LD0112215789 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 1 TASS—The People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic adopted this evening an address to the Federal Assembly and the peoples of Czechoslvoakia, expressing a regret over the GDR's participation in military actions of the Warsaw Treaty members states in connection with the domestic events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and bringing apologies on behalf of the republic's people.

The document stresses that the People's Chamber pays respects to the Federal Assembly and the peoples of Czechoslovakia and expresses sympathy with the start of deep-going democratic changes in society.

The GDR, as well as its Warsaw Treaty allies, confirms that it will do its best that the principles of international law, including non-interference, equality, sovereignty and the non-use of force, should operate in international relations, the address concludes.

IZVESTIYA Interviews New Forum Leaders

PM0112181589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Report on interview with New Forum founders Dr Ingo Klein and Engineer Gerald Burkert by own correspondent V. Lapskiy in Berlin: "New Forum: Time Is Hurrying Us On"; date of interview not given; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Berlin—A large number of organizations and movements of different characters and complexions have emerged on the wave of the "peaceful revolution" in the GDR. New Forum is one which stands out against that background.

New Forum's history (it came into being in spring this year) is short and dramatic. Shortly before the "change of guard" in the GDR, the Interior Ministry refused to recognize the movement's right to exist and justified that by saying that there was no "social need" for it. Now the situation has changed as, furthermore, has the movement itself, which, according to official figures, numbers over 200,000 people.

I met with the initiators of New Forum (the movement still has no clear structure or leadership in the conventional sense) in the district of Pankow, where it came into being. My interlocutors were Dr Ingo Klein, a staffer at the Economics Institute, and Gerald Burkert, an engineer at an electrical equipment plant.

[Klein] "New Forum," I. Klein said, "is mainly composed of people from the technical and creative intelligentsia. But probably all social strata of the GDR are represented. The majority are in the age range 30 to 40."

[Lapskiy] What idea cemented the movement together?

[Klein] The initial standpoint was the clear understanding that the public has no opportunity of conducting a direct dialogue with the country's leadership, which ignored the glaring symptoms of the crisis until the last moment. In the conditions that existed the masses were doomed to remain silent. That was when, in our opinion, it became necessary to mobilize people and call on the top leaders finally to heed the voice of the people."

[Burkert] "Perestroyka in the Soviet Union," G. Burkert said, joining in the conversation, "had a perceptible influence on us. In the evangelical circles in which I used to move it inspired the hope that ultimately the process of transformations would spread to the GDR as well."

[Klein] "I am an atheist," I. Klein said, "but I regularly attended discussions in Berlin churches. I should like to make the general point that quite a few members of the Socialist Unity Party participated in the discussions. The country's leadership, however, did not want to listen to what we were saying and saw us as troublemakers."

[Lapskiy] Your initial aim was to "nudge" the leadership to a dialogue with society. Now, under the new leadership, dialogue is taking place on a scale which even you yourself probably did not envisage. What is your aim now?

[Klein] "First, to make the processes that have begun irreversible," Klein replied. "Second, to support everything in the government's program which corresponds to society's interests. And last, to oppose those things that are contrary to these interests. Now we are preparing the

movement's draft program and draft statutes. New Forum's founding congress is scheduled for 27 January."

[Lapskiy] What is your attitude toward the new government?

[Klein] "Hans Modrow, the present chairman of the Council of Ministers, was nominated under pressure from the party masses, or of the street if you will. At the initial demonstrations people simply chanted his name. Undoubtedly the previous Politburo would not have allowed him to hold such a high post. His reputation during his long years of work with the Dresden party organization is spotless. Hans Modrow enjoys a 'stock of trust.' The government program which he set out takes quite a few steps in the right direction, primarily with regard to municipal policy, the development of democracy, foreign policy, and many areas of domestic policy. On the key economic questions, unfortunately, we have seen no clear concept. You can attach any adjectives you like to the 'market economy' concept in socialist conditions, but the main thing is that it cannot be introduced 'piecemeal.' It must exist as a system. It is necessary to decide on radical and well-considered reforms. The historical experience of the GDR and other socialist countries, first and foremost the Soviet Union, shows that the structures produced over decades are so strong that it is difficult to overcome them quickly. These structures try to strangle the new at birth. In our view, the main cause of the crisis in the USSR today is precisely the fact that the resistance of those structures has not been broken down. We have no right to repeat old mistakes.

"We often refer to Russia's rapid transition from 'war communism' to the NEP [Lenin's New Economic Policy]—we have to make a leap forward to the market economy in exactly the same way while holding the economic and social levers firmly in our hands. Time is hurrying us on. Our economy has already been weakened. The old system led the country into an impasse."

[Burkert] "We favor the introduction of foreign capital in the country," G. Burkert said, "and the creation together with capitalists of joint ventures, which incidentally we still do not have. It is important in the new conditions to show competence and responsibility—things which the old leadership lacked. Western credits were used unwisely. Currency discipline was violated and a considerable proportion of the currency was not used for its intended purpose. We must create a new law which, without harming the republic, would ensure the reliable protection of Western capital investments. We favor the substantial expansion of our cooperation with the FRG but believe that it should not affect our independence."

[Lapskiy] How do you view the idea of "German unification" which is being discussed so much in the FRG now?

[Burkert] "We are one nation but two countries. Our statehood and, if you like, identity must be preserved."

[Lapskiy] How do you envisage the future GDR?

[Klein] "We are a small country," I. Klein said, "dependent to a large extent on what goes on around the GDR. We have an opportunity, perhaps the last one, for independent socialist development, but it will depend to a considerable extent on the success of the reforms in the USSR."

30 Nov Appeal to GDR Public to Support Socialism

PM0112144589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Appeal to the Public"]

[Text] Berlin, 30 Nov—While the FRG puts forward proposals on the reunification of Germany, and the granting of economic aid to the GDR is made contingent on its abandonment of the socialist system, we appeal to our compatriots to support our republic's socialist future. This is stated in the appeal to the GDR public "For Our Country," made in the press by well-known writers, lawyers, doctors, philosophers, and representatives of GDR opposition movements. E. Krenz, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and H. Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, signed the appeal yesterday.

In his letter to the authors of the appeal E. Krenz noted that he shares the concern expressed in the document over the gravity of the situation. I assure you, he pointed out, that I will do everything possible to contribute to the development of a socialist society in the country, in which peace, social justice, and freedom for all are guaranteed. "We have a historic responsibility: to preserve this country along with its antifascist and humanitarian ideals and traditions as a socialist German state," E. Krenz stressed.

ADN on Berlin People's Chain for Democracy

LD0312172489 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin, Dec. 3, TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports:

Berlin (ADN)—Thousands of people formed a chain through the German Democratic Republic on Sunday expressing their determination for democratic renewal of the country.

Heeding a call by numerous organizations they formed the chain along several trunk roads from the northernmost place to the south and from the east to the west between 1200 and 1215 p.m.

Carrying burning candles, banners and posters they expressed their concern at the future of the country and demanded a renewal and the punishment of those guilty of abuse of power and corruption.

In Berlin at noon, people took each other's hands and entered the streets, forming a chain which partly consisted of several rows. At 1215 p.m. they went home as peacefully as they had come.

Issue of German Reunification Viewed

PM2811170589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent Ye. Bovkun dispatch: "The German Question: Outlines and Reality"]

[Text] Bonn—The dialectics of social development lift taboos on some subjects more rapidly than the official authorities decide to do. Only yesterday, the German question, which was deemed by our departments and press at the end of the 60's to be a closed topic, was still a lacuna in the awareness of most Soviet citizens, but now the storm of reaction in the FRG to the reform process in the GDR and the events in the border zone, full of inner drama, have become the object of universal attention. Some people have probably asked themselves in amazement: How can it be that the "unification of Germany," always considered an attribute of revanchist propaganda, is suddenly being discussed in the FRG, Britain, France, the United States, and other countries as a possible future reality? Some speak of this with misgiving and even fear, others with hope, but few with indifference.

Many have been amazed by the actual pace of development of events. First there were the FRG embassies in neighboring socialist countries filled to overflowing with refugees, some "escapees" to the West, and the euphoria at the first semilegal mass emigration through Hungary, then the sharp change of direction taken by the GDR in favor of reforms, the opening of the border, the first breaches in the Berlin Wall, and scenes of fraternization between the police and ordinary citizens. In the last 10 days, Bonn has twice debated the German question in the Bundestag, with the active involvement of representatives of all parliamentary factions.

It is hard to foresee what the future holds, but I would venture to express the belief that the qualitative change in relations between the two German states will accelerate in the direction of normalization.

President R. von Weizsaecker considers possible a kind of development which will lead to a state of affairs with no analogy in the past. Social Democrat W. Brandt believes that the time of small steps in German politics is irrevocably past. Christian Democrat H. Kohl intends to make the German question the main subject of interparty debate on the eve of the next elections to the Bundestag. "Greens" Deputy A. Mechtersheimer can see the outlines of a "reunified, green Germany" free of any foreign military presence. Naturally, all these statements reflect different ideas on the ways in which the two German states could develop, but they do have the same starting point.

The features of postwar European development, including the absence of a peace treaty with Germany and the allied accords, gave the founders of the West German state reason to consider the FRG as the legal continuation of the previous state formation. Its constitution includes a clause on all-German citizenship which still allows local authorities to automatically recognize all emigrants of German origin from socialist countries as citizens of the FRG.

Citizenship, as is well known, is not dependent on nationality in legal terms. People of various nationalities can be citizens of the state. State citizenship is a person's political and legal connection with a particular state, which gives both sides rights and imposes obligations upon them.

But political scientists in the FRG are placing the concept of "nation" above the concepts of "statehood" and "citizenship." Hence the prolonged refusal to give de jure recognition to the existence of another German state, that was not overcome even after the FRG concluded the eastern treaties in the seventies.

The GDR's decisive change of direction in favor of reforms has placed Bonn's ruling coalition in a difficult situation. The merging of the GDR and the FRG, with the automatic intermingling of political and social structures, has proven difficult to imagine—even for those in the FRG who have been secretly hoping for a new "Anschluss." The idea of neutralizing the GDR and the FRG on the basis of their "earliest possible withdrawal" from the military blocs has, on closer examination, proven to be a utopian idea.

In the past 40 or so years, Germans in the FRG have created a liberal-democratic state system. In this respect they have succeeded in retaining some positive Prussian traditions, such as a sense of duty and a strong work ethic, for example.

The social market economy of Erhard, who succeeded Adenauer in running the country, was not interpreted as an exclusively internal task. His policy created the possibilities for incorporating the FRG in the world trade system. Erhard, it is true, was skeptical of excessive Western integration, including the "Common Market," fearing protectionist trends—and in some respects he has been proven right. He, incidentally, was responsible for laying the international foundations of FRG claims to single representation of all Germany's interests. But, as a result and with the help of Western integration, the FRG became not totally "German."

State interests drew it close to the West. After Adenauer, the sphere of the chancellor's political decisions began to shrink. More and more state institutions in the FRG itself and in neighboring countries have become involved in shaping its foreign policy. On the threshold of the nineties, the chancellor has comparatively limited scope for autonomous foreign policy actions. More than 90 percent of the decisions have to be taken within the multilateral framework of NATO, the "Common

Market," the European Parliament, and other organizations. At the same time, its historical development has turned the FRG from being a spiritually, economically, and politically half-dead "three-zone state" into a major European power.

The German question is still considered unresolved here, but it is now being formulated differently. The demand for reunification sounds anachronistic to many people. Preference is now given to the right to self-determination. Back in May 1985, President von Weizsaecker said in his famous speech: "There must be no constitutional precept of unification that would be at variance with the precept of mutual understanding with our neighbors and respect for their own statehood." One should therefore expect that, as a result of the democratic reforms in the GDR, the FRG's respect for its statehood will grow.

Industrialists were among the first to assess the advantages of normalized inter-German relations (Bonn still anachronistically refers to them as "inner-German relations"). They are prepared not simply to broaden existing contacts but also to bring about qualitative changes in these contacts, going as far as setting up joint enterprises. "Our aim is to help to raise labor productivity in the GDR," one authoritative manager said in a recent television interview. "This will be easier to do than in other socialist countries, given the absence of a language barrier." Will this be done to the detriment of the FRG's economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and Poland, say? That possibility cannot be ruled out.

True, the opening of the border is creating additional social and economic difficulties for the FRG itself. The influx of refugees is so great that some border towns have declared a state of emergency. The country's housing problem has been aggravated. It is planned to invest DM8 billion in this sphere over the next 4 years. There are not enough tent cities. The U.S. Command has given instructions to make some of their barracks available to the emigrants.

In the opinion of local sociologists, their integration into new sociopolitical and economic structures will be a painful process. Many will have to content themselves with unemployment benefit for some time to come. There is going to be additional tension in the labor market. Next year, the able-bodied population will increase by 340,000. Money is needed for new social programs.

Other items of expenditure are also appearing in the federal budget. The FRG Government is handing out DM100 to every refugee as "welcome money." But in the last few days alone, several million citizens from the GDR have been given exit visas.

Only a few thousand intend to settle in the West permanently, however, and some of those who came here earlier are now asking to go back, which attests to the increased state awareness of GDR citizens. But, even despite this, the FRG is now home to some 3 million ex-citizens of the neighboring German state who have come here at different times.

The federal authorities are also facing other problems. Nevertheless, the search for new forms of national community is going on. "We must not deprive our imagination of the image of a single German state," the well known politician O. Schily, who recently left the Green Party for the Social Democratic Party of Germany, said. However, he urges the government to abandon the outmoded constitutional-legal formulas on the existence of a German Reich. Other Social Democrats consider the unification of the two German states possible only in the conditions of a democratic Europe, with no territorial claims made by the FRG on other countries. Even members of the ruling coalition speak of the inviolability of the Eastern borders.

The stand taken by the allies has considerable importance in this respect. Bonn clearly understands that their theoretical readiness to support the idea of reunification, stemming from the "common treaty" with the FRG of 1952, and practical measures in this direction are different things. Since the first positive assessments of the turnabout in German-German relations, the FRG capital has received alarmed reports from West European countries. Britain links the prospect of German unification with notions of a "Fourth Reich." Giscard d'Estaing has expressed fears on behalf of the French regarding the consequences of German economic might.

Evidently these fears are premature. No one can say at present what the new Germany of the future might be. If we look to past experience, we will have to say that, throughout the ages, the Germans have not succeeded in combining the three concepts of "nation," "people," and "state" for long periods. The Germans have never all lived together in one state. Even their culture has never been an all-state culture. The representatives of this culture have lived in Weimar and Vienna, Berlin and Basel, Frankfurt and Prague, Wolfenbuettel and Rome.

"Germany? But where is it to be sought? I cannot find such a country!" Schiller exclaimed. Goethe was sure that the Germans were motivated by a spirit of ambivalence and a desire to stand aloof. Perhaps the great thinkers were right, because all attempts to form a single German state in the past have been unsuccessful and, moreover, accompanied by violence.

Heinrich III succeeded in unifying three kingdoms in the 11th century—Germany, Italy, and Burgundy—but, since the late Middle Ages, division and internecine fighting have determined the course of German history.

A state document of 1815 refers to "the lands and regions of the German union (federation)." In the 1849 draft constitution, the concept of "the German people" is interpreted as "the population of the states forming the German Reich." The second empire of 1871 regarded itself as "all Germany," but there was no such territorial unit either before or after the lost wars. The preamble to the 1919 Weimar Constitution states that

the Reich is represented by "the territories of German lands" and that "other lands may be incorporated in it if their population exercises their right to self-determination." The "Greater German Reich" planned by the Nazis for the next 1,000 years collapsed within 12 years. The German question, in the sense of statehood, was once again an open question.

... We intend to build a common European home together, in which various "established domestic procedures" will evidently be preserved. Whether its inhabitants will feel calm and safe and whether the need for locked basements and garrets will disappear depends on the development of joint accords. The most important thing is to ensure that the balance of interests of other Europeans is not upset and that the political, economic, and social structures of postwar Europe, which have evolved over the decades and serve as the only guarantee of its future security, are not destroyed.

BCP Chief Mladenov Interviewed on Reforms

PM0312205789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Petur Mladenov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, by Boris Averchenko, member of the PRAVDA Editorial Collegium, and PRAVDA's correspondent in Bulgaria Leonid Zhymrev: "True Socialism Is Our Choice"; date, place of interview not given; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Petur Mladenov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, will be visiting our country at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. On the eve of his departure for Moscow he received Boris Averchenko, member of the PRAVDA Editorial Collegium, and PRAVDA's correspondent in Bulgaria Leonid Zhmyrev and answered questions put to him. This interview is published below.

[Correspondents] Esteemed Comrade Mladenov! Taking this opportunity, we want to convey to you the cordial congratulations voiced in letters from our readers in connection with your election to high party and state posts.

The events in fraternal Bulgaria are arousing the keenest interest of the Soviet public. What would you characterize as the main reasons for the current changes in your country?

[Mladenov] First of all, I would like—through you, Comrade PRAVDA employees, and your newspaper—to thank Soviet people for their congratulations on my election as general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council. I see these congratulations as approval of the course of renewal being implemented by our two parties and states and as an expression of the warm feelings that link the Bulgarian and Soviet peoples. That is also how I interpret the Soviet public's keen interest in events in Bulgaria that you have mentioned.

I would answer your question as follows: As you are well aware, very serious problems have accumulated in Bulgaria in the economic, social, and spiritual spheres, and in the sphere of political relations. These problems remained unresolved for a long time, threatening to develop into a real social crisis. I am convinced that the bureaucratic edict system's inability to react appropriately to urgent needs and contemporary demands for economic, social, and cultural progress was the main reason for this state of affairs. Our country lagged badly behind world development trends and found itself on the sidelines.

The November (10 November 1989) plenum and the decisions that followed it, which were of key significance for our country's future life, were needed to escape from this critical situation.

[Correspondents] Soviet people are well aware that Bulgaria was one of the first countries to follow our example and embark on the path of perestroyka and renewal. We would even say that it anticipated us in many respects. For at times the most ultrarevolutionary decisions were adopted, yet neither the party nor society realized this. What is the crux of the matter here?

[Mladenov] Let us clarify one point. In the early 1980's people in Bulgaria did indeed begin to talk of the need for a radical renewal of state and public structures. This shows that our public and the party as a whole saw the need for resolute changes. Views were developed that analyzed the difficulties and drew conclusions as to how to overcome them.

But it soon became clear that there could be no question of real perestroyka, above all because the roots of the problems had not been revealed. For this reason all the strategic concepts with their fine-sounding names were built on sand. Instead of paying attention to obvious ailments and limitations within the system, they sought to lay the blame on "mistakes" on the part of the classical authors, on the original sins of the revolution, and on external influences—anywhere they liked apart from where real power was exercised and where leading decisions were adopted.

If you want a couple of words to sum up the essence of these "ultrarevolutionary decisions" that you mentioned, I must be blunt and say that they constituted in effect feverish reorganizations and cadre reshuffles that had nothing in common with the long-overdue profound democratic transformations in the foundations and the superstructure. This can be attributed to the fact that the supreme leadership of the time did not effectively want real far-reaching reforms, afraid that they might affect its monopoly on power. This approach was transparent to the whole people and the party, and that is why they were, naturally, unable to accept such "transformations," which were simply not the people's affair.

[Correspondents] What do you see as the purpose of perestroyka? What are its aims, in your view?

[Mladenov] The purpose of the perestroyka that the party and all patriotic forces have undertaken today is to escape from the state of stagnation and transform Bulgaria into a progressive and modern socialist state.

As for my vision of our immediate aims and tasks, I could set out the following:

- tell the people the truth about the situation in which the nation finds itself;
- immediately outline a concrete stabilization program in the socioeconomic sphere;
- ameliorate the social atmosphere by democratizing all state and political institutions from top to bottom;
- lay, together with our entire people, the solid foundations of a self-managing civil society;
- create the kind of social mechanisms that would prevent a reversal in any guise.

[Correspondents] How do you imagine the new model, the new look of socialism?

[Mladenov] That is a hard question, I can hardly give it an exhaustive answer, it is being pondered by our entire society and, I believe, by Soviet people. We are all rereading the founders of our philosophy. We are waiting for life itself to suggest a particular concrete solution in the course of the implementation of our reforms.

I will begin with some irrefutable truths. Our people chose socialism via revolution. They endured many rigorous ordeals for the sake of the socialist ideal. Our working class, our intelligentsia, and our peasantry worked selflessly for the sake of building socialism. Working people saw the realization of their ancient aspirations—people's power, progress, and social justice—in socialism. Driven by this noble aim, our people created the foundations of a social system free of exploitation. I am profoundly convinced that mankind still does not and cannot have a better alternative than the socialist ideal.

It must be said with regret that our development along this path underwent certain deformations. Now it would be easier for me to say what socialism should not be like. Socialism must not be identified with the omnipotence of the state-party apparatus; socialism cannot mean a society without democracy that lives by edicts and directives; and socialism cannot be an oasis of privations, backwardness, and isolation from the rest of the world. Disrespect for human rights and a personal or family-clan dictatorship that justifies its autocracy by ideological exhortations—this is not socialism, but a blatant negation of socialism.

How do we perceive the renewal of socialism? We perceive it primarily as a rebirth. A rebirth of Marx' principle of the identity of communism and humanism. A rebirth of our Bulgarian tradition, the tradition of Blagoev and Dimitrov, of a united democratic and people's front. We are striving for **genuine** socialism, the sole yardstick of which is the emancipation and elevation of the human individual. This is the core of our contemporary perception of socialism, and this is the socialism for whose sake we will work without sparing our energies.

What is the meaning of the term "new model"? It seems to me that we have already talked too much of different models. It would be much better to really get down to the creation of genuine socialism, the way the people perceive it.

[Correspondents] What do you consider to be the main and fundamental aspect of the BCP's activity at the present and in the immediate future? What do you see as the obstacles and difficulties expected to be encountered along the chosen path?

[Mladenov] In order to be the vanguard and leading force in the process of renewal the BCP must confidently and decisively get down to its own renewal—as regards style and methods, and as regards cadres, but primarily as regards the way of thinking and the perception of priorities. We must not simply develop the statutory provisions and organizational criteria, but must also realize the party's qualitatively new responsibility to society and approach from this position the shaping and implementation of its policy.

We have already declared, and done so categorically: The party must not be an echelon of the administrative power, because this becomes a breeding ground for sundry deformations. The functions of the party and state will be separated in the conditions of all-embracing democratization. This, however, does not mean that the BCP's role in the entire life of the nation will be diminished; quite the contrary, it is envisaged that this role will be elevated to a much higher and more civilized level. The crucial question for the BCP is to take possession of "its own territory," gain the people's trust, and boost their initiative and energy in all spheres of renewal.

For this purpose the BCP will have to act even more vigorously and energetically for the prompt and fair solution of pressing questions at all levels, beginning with the congress and ending with the grass-roots party organizations. We will be unable to achieve the desired changes unless we transform the Central Committee, the Politburo, the Secretariat, and the local party committees into political staffs of perestroyka. The party must be capable of mobilizing both its members and the remaining citizens for creativity and creation in behalf of the entire people's prosperity. It must do this not through orders handed down from above but through the captivating effect of ideas, labor, and moral example.

There will be not a few difficulties and obstacles. The greatest of these will, no doubt, be rooted within our own selves. They are inertia, ossified stereotypes, and routine. It has already been noted that there are indeed real forces with strong ties to the bureaucratic-authoritarian model that will strive for its restoration. Voices can also

be heard demanding social revenge. People will use the development of the complex economic situation to see what lessons the party has learned from the past and how correct it is in finding its way in the situation.

In other words, tremendous political efforts lie ahead, and their success will depend on the working people, on the whole people and their commitment to the cause of perestroyka. This is a difficult path, but the party has decided to follow it through to the end without deviation.

[Correspondents] In your speech at the 10 November plenum you specifically mentioned the need to "strengthen national unity." Is this in any way connected with the "Bulgarian Muslims" problem?

[Mladenov] The breakthrough our society so badly needs cannot be achieved without national unity, without rallying the people. In saying this I in no way mean the traditional dogmatic perception of unity as a barracks system designed for unquestioning and automatic execution of superiors' orders. I mean broad unity of actions by the people in implementing the socialist choice, in implementing such national interests as Bulgaria's integrity, independence, and prosperity. All classes and strata of our society have their place in this unity of actions—workers, peasants, members of the intelligentsia, Communists, nonparty people, all patriotic social organizations and associations, believers and atheists. As in any other civilized country following the path of progress, we take national unity to mean a union of absolutely equal and free citizens to whom the motherland's future is precious.

You mentioned the Bulgarian Muslims. You are familiar with the problem's history; it has its own specific features. They are our brothers. We respect their feelings and traditions.

[Correspondents] The similarity between the processes of renewal in a number of socialist countries is now often mentioned. In your view, what is there in common between Soviet and Bulgarian perestroyka? Are there any differences, any variations?

[Mladenov] There is nothing surprising in the fact that similarity is talked about. We all suffered the same from the administrative-edict system, from the low level of political culture, from the narrow understanding of socialism. The barriers are now coming down and creative human energy aimed at ren al is becoming that main driving force, common to the socialist countries, of the processes.

As for the things in common and the differences between Soviet and Bulgarian perestroyka, I think the things in common far outnumber those that distinguish us. The things in common are the unshakable socialist choice of our peoples and their desire for more real socialism in conditions of democracy and glasnost. Our difficulties are fundamentally similar, too. Of course, it is hard to compare the actual dimensions of the questions to be tackled. The USSR is a vast country and a great world power. Its problems and prospects are on the same scale.

We are a small state. Our strengths and potential are immeasurably smaller, and we know that. Today we rely on international law, we take part in the European dialogue, we strive to be open to the world and to communicate with the community of developed and cultured countries. But for all that we will always regard friendship with the Soviet Union as a vitally important condition of our progress, prosperity, and security. That for us is the main historical and political reality. We sincerely wish every success to the epoch-making cause of Soviet perestroyka, to the CPSU Central Committee, and to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev personally.

[Correspondents] How would you characterize today's mental attitudes in Bulgarian society and the main trends in their development—in particular, the attitude of different sections of the population to the BCP, the Warsaw Pact, CEMA, and the USSR?

[Mladenov] Our entire country is now in a ferment of thoughts and reappraisals, new ideas, and spontaneous eruptions of feelings. You hear reproaches, bold proposals, and great hopes expressed. It is absolutely clear that the entire people is on the move—a living, thinking, feeling people, with multifarious aspirations and interests. But despite that variety and that polyphony of emotions and passions, the general conviction stands out in clear relief that in Bulgaria there is no force other than the BCP capable of leading the people toward consolidation and development. You can hear that at rallies, in auditoriums, at work places, on village squares, and in our citizens' homes.

This is no mere happenstance. For all the mistakes and failures, the BCP has demonstrated with its blood its devotion to the people and its readiness to serve them. This historical asset of Bulgaria's Communists, which no one can take away from them, is today helping the party win fresh trust among the people.

As for our attitude toward the Warsaw Pact, CEMA, and the Soviet Union, new and interesting things may be said there, too.

Our people recognize CEMA's positive role at a certain stage, a certain period of time. But they clearly understand that it needs fundamental perestroyka if it is to be in tune with the demands of the present day. The Warsaw Pact is the only multilateral politico-defensive alliance to which Bulgaria belongs. So long as Europe remains divided into blocs and there are weapons of mass destruction sited and armies equipped with modern weapons deployed near our borders, that alliance is perceived by the Bulgarian people as necessary for their security.

Alongside this, today, when East and West are switching from confrontation to cooperation, the role of the military components in their security systems is objectively diminished in favor of the political. Intensive and

fruitful talks on disarmament in Europe are currently under way between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Communication between them aimed at establishing trust and eliminating the "enemy image" is expanding. All this weakens confrontation and gives new significance to the alliances and hence to the participation of individual countries in them.

I have already mentioned briefly our people's attitude to the USSR. I believe that the Bulgarians' deep feelings for Russia and the Soviet peoples are well known to PRAVDA readers and to you yourself. Over many long years those feelings remained unshaken by monarchist intrigues, fascist regimes, incompetent and venal rulers, and those who denigrate and deny history. The great truth is that the ordinary Bulgarian's faith in the Soviet land and the motherland of the socialist revolution has never been stronger than it is now at the time of the great perestroyka of socialism. In essence, the gaze of the whole world is fixed on it.

[Correspondents] In your view, in what specific way and in what direction does the practice of Bulgaria's relations with the USSR and the other CEMA members need adjustment? What are your thoughts on the renewal of the mechanism of collaboration among the states belonging to CEMA? Have the recent events introduced anything new into Bulgaria's foreign policy as a whole?

[Mladenov] Life abhors rigid schemes. The practice of relations between the socialist countries, in particular between Bulgaria and the USSR, needs renewal. They can and must be cleansed of all the existing accretions of empty rhetoric, banner waving, and formalism. The new approaches of efficiency, responsibility, real cooperation, and fraternal mutual understanding must be fully asserted in them.

To your question of whether our party and state's November course is adding anything new to Bulgaria's foreign policy, I would answer yes. We have taken the firm decision to back up our initiatives in the cause of peace and cooperation by setting our own house in order. We want contact with the rest of the world as an open, flourishing, and democratic socialist state. We consider that in these conditions our contribution to the solution of international problems will be more real and our foreign ties will have a more favorable impact from the viewpoint of the goals and tasks being resolved by Bulgarian society and the people.

[Correspondents] Many PRAVDA readers ask about your career, your family, and your hobbies. In conclusion, could you tell us a little about yourself?

[Mladenov] What can I tell PRAVDA readers that would be of interest? I was born into a peasant family in 1936—before our revolution, as the saying goes. My father, a Communist and a member of the antifascist partisan movement, was killed in 1944. I completed high school in the town of Vidin, I read philosophy at Sofia University, and in 1963 I graduated with distinction from the Moscow State Institute of International Relations. I was a secretary of the Communist Youth Union Central Committee and first secretary of the Vidin party okrug committee. From late 1971 until 10 November 1989 I was foreign minister and in 1974 and 1977, respectively, I was elected candidate member and member of the BCP Central Committee.

I married in 1964: My wife's name is Galya. We have a daughter who is married now, and our first granddaughter, Aleksandra. I love good books, I listen to music, I like the fine arts, and when I have the opportunity I really like to spend time in the open air, and sometimes I go hunting. In other words, I like the things and activities that any normal working man likes. But the greatest joy and pleasure for me outside my official duty is to find a spare hour or minute to be with my family a little longer.

Mladenov, Papazov Discuss Press Freedom

PM0112145589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Truth Is the Criterion"]

[Text] Sofia, 30 Nov—P. Mladenov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, and N. Papazov, Politburo member and secretary of the BCP Central Committee, had a meeting here with leaders of the Bulgarian media and prominent journalists.

The meeting participants talked about the problems that concern Bulgarian journalists and the state of affairs in journalism. Support was expressed for the BCP's new political course.

Summing up, P. Mladenov pointed out that the truth—whether it is palatable or not—should play the leading role in the work of the media. Only on this basis can the policy of renewal be developed. The Bulgarian leader noted that in order to make progress, what is needed now is the unity of public forces and all those who are concerned about Bulgaria's future.

Bulgaria Says 1968 CSSR Invasion 'Unjustified'

LD0312163989 Moscow TASS in English 1543 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Sofia December 3 TASS—The Politburo of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and the Bulgarian Government on Saturday considered the issue concerning the bringing of troops of Warsaw Treaty states to Czechoslovakia in 1968.

It was pointed out that the decision taken at that time was shaped by the international situation of the late 1960s characterised by confrontation, arms race and acute ideological antagonism, a report circulated by the Bulgarian news agency BTA says.

The making of the decision was seriously influenced by the deformed notions of socialist society and relationships between countries that predominated at that time in theory and practice and did damage to socialism and the communist movement, the report says.

From today's point of view, from the positions of restructuring and new political thinking, the actions that were performed in the August of 1968 were unjustified and illegal.

Those actions have been disproved by historical practice. They are incompatible with the Bulgarian Communist Party's and Bulgaria's new policy.

The renewal processes in Czechoslovakia are regarded with understanding and sympathy in Bulgaria. Confidence is being expressed that they will develop in the interests of the Czechoslovak people and the cause of socialism, the BTA report says.

Soviet Commander Foresees Total CSSR Pullout

PM0112131389 London ITN Televison Network in English 1900 GMT 30 Nov 89

[From the "Channel 4 News" program: Nick Gowing report on Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia]

[Text] [Gowing] There are 75,000 Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia, a total of 5 divisions of the Red Army's Central Group. They are stationed on the Warsaw Pact front line facing West Germany, equipped with the latest tanks and offensive weaponry, ready both to mount a surprise attack against NATO forces in Western Europe and, since 1968, a support for the hardline communist leadership installed by Brezhnev after the Soviet-led invasion.

Today the commander in chief of Soviet forces raised the prospect that the political changes here will eventually lead to the Kremlin withdrawing all troops from Czechoslovakia.

[Colonel General Eduard Vorobev, in Russian with superimposed English translation] The time will come when the Soviet troops will leave from the territory of Czechoslovakia themselves. Now we support the new process which is, to our mind, the continuation of the new political thinking policy in the framework of glasnost, democratization, and humanization of socialism.

[Gowing] Mlada Boleslav is one of the main Soviet garrison towns in Czechoslovakia. Since 1968 the Soviet military have had a dominant presence. Like any garrison town in Britain the local economy is geared to the substantial presence of troops and families. Now, with the Czechoslovak prime minister and official sources in Moscow pointing to an eventual denunciation of the 1968 Soviet invasion, towns like Mlada Boleslav are beginning to talk of something unthinkable just a few days ago—the emptying of the giant Soviet barracks and training grounds and the departure of Soviet troops, which despite the official line were never welcome here. "They have no purpose here," said this man. "Soviet troops should have been away a long time ago." "They should leave," said this woman. "I'll be very glad if they go, because then we can have more food," said this man. "Our state cannot support all these army people."

It was the Soviet military who led Warsaw Pact troops to crush the Prague Spring in 1968. Until now even Soviet officials have refused to accept that the invasion was a mistake, even though this year they did finally admit that Afghanistan had been a mistake. Now the Red Army itself accepts that Czechoslovaks are demanding a reexamination of 1968 and the cancellation of the agreement signed 2 months after the invasion under which Soviet troops remain here.

[Vorobev] I know that some groups and people in Czechoslovakia raised this question. That is why I think there is a possibility that this question can be put in this way. In one of our regiments near Sumperk 2 days ago, a large group of children gathered at the entrance to the base to ask our Soviet soldiers to go home.

[Gowing] This afternoon we found Soviet troops on the move outside Prague. A week ago such Soviet military movements would have been viewed with deep concern, raising fears of Soviet troops preparing to crush the pro-reform protests. General Vorobev said that Soviet troops had never been put on alert.

[Vorobev] No requests were submitted, neither to me personally nor to the commanders, regiments, and detachments for us to do anything in connection with the recent events. Moreover, there was friendly advice to stop all movements planned for military training of our combat vehicles and army personnel in the direction of Prague and other towns. These movements could have been classified as provocative by nonfriendly forces.

[Gowing] So, as tension rose in the past fortnight, Soviet troops stayed in their barracks. The order to minimize troop movements meant that the 6-monthly rotation of Red Army conscripts had to be reorganized, for a large number of troops to be seen flying in and out would have compounded the tension. General Vorobev says the Red Army has now introduced a new consultation procedure to avoid misunderstandings.

[Vorobev] Now, when we move our columns of equipment, we inform local officials about where we are going. And they understand us, and they accept us.

[Gowing] Western diplomatic sources say a substantial withdrawal of Soviet troops is not likely before a formal East-West agreement at the negotiations in Vienna on conventional forces in Europe. They also say there is no evidence of any preparations for a withdrawal, even for those Soviet troops Mr Gorbachev says will leave in 1990. Nick Gowing, ITN, Mlada Boleslav in Czechoslovakia.

Changed Appraisal of 1968 Intervention Noted

LD0212173689 Moscow International Service in Czech 1600 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Aleksandr Shakhin commentary: "Subjective Remarks"]

[Text] Stormy changes are hitting Czechoslovakia. A complicated process of revival and reforms is underway in the country. There is a crisis of values in social life. Voices asking for a reassessment of the 1968 events are being heard all the time with more urgency. Today we include in our program a comment by a Radio Moscow commentator on this subject, to which he gave the title "subjective remarks."

I recall Wenceslas Square, the pride of Prague, says Aleksandr Shakhin. How many things it has witnessed in the course of many centuries. Twenty-one years ago it witnessed a national drama: in August 1968, foreign tanks appeared here. How did it happen? Then the answers were more simple: Counterrevolution, defense of the principles of socialism, internationalist help.

From today's standpoint, when we start from today's ideas, we assess the Prague Spring differently. Two decades ago, in the socialist world, relations ruled which the West called simply "the Brezhnev doctrine." We are not going to argue about terms. What matters is that then the principle of the one only model of socialism was held valid. Any deviation from the norm gave the allies a reason to intervene.

We are divided from that time by an entire epoch. Now it is clear to all that no universal models exist. Every nation decided independently about its destiny; it independently chooses its system. Nobody, under any pretext, can intervene from outside, Mikhail Gorbachev noted in this context. Nobody can enforce his ideas on the policy of another country.

The word pluralism is now in vogue, and its impact is probably felt on the issue of the Prague Spring. However, we can understand the standpoint expressed by CSSR Premier Ladislav Adamec, when he said recently that it is not possible to talk about this question with closed eyes. In the interest of a dialogue, this question must be solved politically. Nevertheless, this is a matter for the higher spheres.

I recall a survey published in our press in which Soviet people expressed their views on those events. I remember the words of a former soldier who, in August 1968, fulfilled his military duty. He said: Prague, I apologize.

CSSR Journalist Recalls 1968 Invasion

PM3011133589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 p 3

[Commentary by MLADA FRONTA scientific commentator Karel Pacner: "Letter from Prague. Shadows of 1968"]

[Text] My dear friends in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA! Visiting your country in May this year for the festival of our newspapers MLADA FRONTA and SMENA, I celebrated 25 years of friendship with you. I came to Moscow for the first time in the fall of 1964 and found true friends in good times and bad. I would scarcely have been able to familiarize myself so thoroughly with the successes, failures, and problems of Soviet science, technology, and, above all, cosmonautics, and write about them in my reports, conversations, and books, if I had had no assistance from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and its readers.

At the beginning of summer 1968, I spent long hours in your editorial office on discussions on the events in the CSSR. At that time I was not yet fully aware of the significance of the "Prague Spring," or our efforts to achieve socialism "with a human face," as we put it then. But despite all the arguments, we came to the conclusion that Czechoslovakia was then stepping onto a new socialist path, onto a path away from the socialism that had turned aside from mankind, toward something else. And, as we all believed, toward something better.

Then came the terrible night of 20-21 August 1968. Aircraft darted above our heads, and Prague radio broadcast information from the session of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee bureau, and reports on the fact that the troops of five Warsaw Pact states had entered Czechoslovakia. Appeals to preserve order rang out.

During those moments, I also remembered you—knowing your opinion—and thought bitterly about what you would be obliged to write about this night.

Then I found myself in Moscow in October 1969. I did not go to your editorial office—I did not know whether it was the right thing to do. I telephoned an old friend, a KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent. He came to fetch me. We got into his car and he started the engine and said: "I don't agree with it...." It was a relief to both of us. When I went to see a professor, cosmonaut, and designer of spacecraft, he said the same thing.

Later, in 1972 or 1973, I am not sure exactly when it was, I was visiting a Bulgarian youth newspaper correspondent in Moscow. There were many people from your editorial office there, the majority of whom I did not know. My arrival was a signal for everyone to start talking about 1968 frankly and critically. I was astonished.... Then everyone stopped talking, and one by one, Soviet people and Bulgarians came up to me and I was moved to tears: I felt for the first time that my friends from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA were with us during that unhappy August night, and that that was a blow to your hopes too.

In spring of 1985 perestroyka began in your country. Gradually we realized that you want to reform the current socialist model so that every person can live well. Socialism is being renewed gradually in other East European states as well—although there have been mistakes,

but perhaps they are impossible to avoid. Now we hope that this opportunity will arise for us, too.

That night of 20-21 August is our common sorrow. Sorrow that has not just affected relations between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. Its consequences have deeply scarred the souls of Czechs and Slovaks. Hundreds of thousands of people have emigrated from our country in recent years. Many of these were outstanding scientists, writers, actors, and painters. The purge in the Czechoslovak Communist Party at the beginning of the 1970's turned hundreds of thousands of former Communists and their families into people on the margins of society, second class citizens. Almost all of us developed one way of talking with our family and friends, and another way for talking in public. Corruption spread, people went away into internal exile. Only a few of us managed to withstand this "normalization" and spoke frankly about all the burning problems. In this way, these people turned into dissidents. Although from a material point of view, we do not live badly, and much better than you; nevertheless, the morale of our peoples became very low.... Our young people, who react to distortions in life with greater sensitivity and anguish, do not want to resign themselves to them.

We must get to the truth about 1968, and find the things that were necessary and reject everything that was a mistake. We must take a look at these moments in our common history together.

Doctor of Economic sciences Viktor Sheynis wrote in IZVESTIYA on 13 October of this year that the "Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact," the incursion into Czechoslovakia, and the "international assistance" in Afghanistan are all links in the same chain. The moral health of Soviet society now depends on whether they can manage to rid themselves of the imperial syndrome, in Sheynis's opinion: "The time has come to speak loudly and distinctly about our responsibility for the 'Brezhnev doctrine.' On a practical level it is defunct. It now remains for us to admit this."

I believe that Viktor Sheynis is absolutely correct. Today it is up to us to look each other in the eye and tell each other the whole truth. Although both you and we are struggling against a mass of everyday problems, in the name of the spiritual health of our peoples we can no longer conceal the truth about August 1968.

Yours sincerely,
Karel Pacner, MLADA FRONTA scientific commentator.

CPCZ Seen Under Increasing Pressure

PM0112161589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent V. Rzhevskiy dispatch under the rubric "Prague Fall-89": "CPCZ: Volte-Face?"]

[Text] Prague—"The Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] is on the defensive. Our opponents have seized the initiative. An opposition has formed and is exerting a strong influence on society—which, incidentally, it is finding quite easy to do. Our predecessors did the maximum for this." This was the frank and self-critical statement made by K. Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, at a nationwide CPCZ aktiv meeting held in Prague, a TASS correspondent in Czechoslovakia reports to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. Program guidelines designed to extricate the party from the crisis and make it face up to the current political events were aired in his speech.

They really are experiencing tough pressure from the opposition which has formed. "Civic Forum" has published its program principles and set out new demands in talks with the government. The brief list of them—the formation of a renewed government by 3 December, the removal from the Constitution of the article on the leading role of one party, the abandonment of Marxism-Leninism as the state ideology, the publication of its own newspapers—is backed up by a threat— otherwise "Civic Forum's" candidacy will be placed at the head of the government.

The question of the rehabilitation of the "Prague spring" of 1968 has been raised persistently in recent days. K. Urbanek touched on it in his speech, too, declaring that "it is necessary to analyze the past years, including all the facts connected with the 1968 events. This is an inalienable part of the process of restoring trust in the party." The same demand has been made by the new organization "Democratic Communists' Forum."

The opposition's dictatorial ways at a fateful hour are also apparent. CTK has reported that the participants in a rally in Ostrava reacted harshly to this and hissed the speech made there by the chairman of "Civic Forum." The government head also made a similar statement yesterday. He noted that the opposition has begun resorting to ultimatum-like demands. In his television address L. Adamec also touched on the painful question of the need to reconsider the 1968 events and proposed that a competent commission of historians from the interested countries tackle this. He advocated accelerating the start of talks with the Soviet side on the temporary presence of Soviet troops on CSSR territory.

Late Wednesday evening the country's parliament made substantial amendments to the CSSR Constitution. The article on the CPCZ's leading role in society was deleted. Henceforth the state's policy in the spheres of culture, upbringing, and education will be built not on Marxist-Leninist ideology but on scientific cognition, patriotism, humanism, and democracy.

A wide range of demands is being made nowadays on different sides. Among the businesslike ones aimed at rectifying the crisis situation there are also secondary ones which divert people, take up precious time, and are a distraction. But it is impossible not to notice the

prevailing sentiment—the majority of working people want to instill order more quickly in their great home. Incidentally, a memorial plaque recalling the tragic events of 17 November 1939 will be placed on one of the buildings in Prague's Narodni Street. It is proposed that students of higher art schools make a draft of it. The services of students and the people in awakening society were appraised yesterday with a "17 November Gold Medal"—the highest award of the International Union of Journalists, which was instituted to commemorate the courage of Czechoslovak students. Their demonstration of 17 November 1939 was fired on by the Hitlerite occupiers. Fate has decreed that this calendar date has entered the history of the body of students and of the entire Czechoslovak people a second time.

Urbanek Addresses National CPCZ Aktiv Meeting

PM3011145689 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "CSSR: Readiness for Dialogue"]

[Text] The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia's [CPCZ's] current tasks, dictated by the present situation in the country, were the subject of a statewide CPCZ aktiv meeting which has ended in Prague. The newly formed party Central Committee Presidium convened Communists from all over the republic to discuss questions connected with preparations for the extraordinary CPCZ Congress and the acceleration of the restructuring of society.

Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, addressed those present.

We must admit, the speaker stated, that the party is on the defensive. Our opponents have seized the initiative. An opposition has formed, and is exerting a strong influence on society. The CPCZ is at the epicenter of the political struggle, and should ensure that its action program is oriented toward this struggle. This means that Communists must unite with everyone who is sincerely committed to building socialism.

The main task today is to concentrate on preparations for the extraordinary CPCZ congress. It is necessary to mobilize the party and ensure that it reacts to the new conditions. Unless we convince rank-and-file Communists and the people that we are capable of achieving our goals within a democratic framework, we will lose. Any attempt to return to the old rut is extremely dangerous for the party.

But it must be said frankly, the CPCZ Central Committee general secretary stressed, that certain forces are seeking to gain control of this movement in the desire to use it for their own selfish purposes and turn it against Communists and socialism in general. They proclaim democracy for everyone, but are reluctant to allow the Communists their say. They are unwilling even to heed the opinion of the students, and talk less and less about their demands.

In effect these forces are interested not in dialogue, but in monologue, in substituting a monopoly of their own for the monopoly of power that they have accused the CPCZ of having. They are making it clear even now what they understand by democracy. This was clearly shown by the 26 November rally in Letenske Square in Prague, when people went so far as to insult the government premier and the head of state.

We have carefully studied the "Civic Forum's" program and have come to the conclusion that this document could form a basis for talks. In terms of a number of approaches and demands, we are not diametrically opposed. Naturally, there are differences, but we must become accustomed to the idea that politics is not conducted solely with people who agree with us. It is our profound conviction that the ideals of socialism, although they have been discredited by erroneous practices, retain their force.

We must become a modern political party which seeks and finds its unique place in society in a democratic and courteous rivalry. We must resolve the cardinal questions of CPCZ history. It is necessary to analyze the past years, including the whole range of facts relating to the 1968 events. This is an integral part of the process of restoring confidence in the party.

We are in favor of turning the economy toward people, in favor of radical and consistent economic reform and structural changes. We reject on principle the proposals for a return to capitalism and the resolution of economic problems through mass unemployment.

We must face up to the truth. Recent days have shown, in all their harsh reality, that the party's influence on political events has not been adequate. Its leadership structures have become fused with the administrative system of management and are cut off from the primary party organizations. This runs counter to the views, convictions, and aspirations of thousands of ordinary party members.

Although many of us, especially those who have given the best years of our lives to the party, find this hard to understand; it must be acknowledged that for the sake of the party's future we must renounce the monopoly of power, accept the challenge, and help to create a pluralist democracy.

Agriculture Meeting Hears Urbanek on CPCZ Role

LD0212153289 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 2 TASS—By TASS correspondents Valeriy Rzhevskiy and Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy:

Karel Urbanek, deputy chairman of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak National Front and Czechoslovak Communist Party (KSC) [CPCZ] chief, addressed the 11th congress of agricutural cooperatives here.

"As a result, people lost hope for genuine transformations. The initiative slipped away to other political forces.

"The need for a radical turn in the party's policy is the principled conclusion we are drawing from the current crisis.

"We firmly and irrevocably abandon the old concept of the leading role of one party and favour humane and democratic socialism and a dialogue with other political forces and movements.

"The first priority is to restore the people's trust in the Communist Party. With this end in view it is fundamentally important to introduce utter clarity to the 1968 tragic events.

"Despite all the complexities of the international political situation of those days, the mounting contradictions in the party and society, and the existence of anti-socialist trends, we hold that the bringing of the armies of five socialist countries was unsubstantiated and the decision to do that was erroneous.

"Therefore, following an analysis of all the historical cirumstances, it is critically necessary to reassess the approach to those events.

"The KSC," The document says, "favours the adoption of a new electoral law that would enable all political parties and public organisations to nominate their candidates for election."

"The Communist Party will invite all working people as genuine masters of the means of production to implement an economic reform.

"We favour the equality of various forms of social and individual ownership. In so doing, the KSC rejects the concept which indirectly suggests returning to the capitalist principles of economic management.

"As Communists we adhere to the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and consider it an open system which must continuously develop and become enriched with new scientific knowledge.

"The KSC will seek to renew the genuine relationship with the working class and to restore the longstanding traditions of reliance on the finest representatives of the intelligentsia.

"The party favours young people, who gained wide political experience in recent weeks, receiving appropriate representation in the political system.

"Under the conditions of the stormy development of events in Europe and the world, the KSC continues to regard the alliance with the Soviet Union as the main guarantee of Czechoslovakia's national security and favours the development of Czechoslovak-Soviet cooperation on the principles of equality, mutual benefit, and fraternal relations between the two peoples.

"The party will consistently favour meeting international commitments that arise from Czechoslovakia's Warsaw Treaty membership, but intends to make its contribution to gradually creating conditions for the disbandment of the military blocs that divide Europe," the document stresses.

New CPCZ Presidium Member Benda Interviewed

PM0312173189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Interview with Bretislav Benda, member of the Czechoslovak Communist Party (CPCZ) Central Committee Presidium, by own correspondent L. Kornilov in Prague under the "IZVESTIYA Interview" rubric: "Become the Leading Force in Fact"; date not given; first paragraph is Kornilov introduction]

[Text] Prague—My interlocutor, Bretislav Benda, an academician, chairman of the Czechoslovak Scientific and Technical Society's Central Council, and a CSSR Federal Assembly deputy, was elected to the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium on the night of 27 November. This is the first time that a representative of the scientific and technical intelligentsia has joined the supreme party organ.

[Kornilov] Have you settled into your new role?

[Benda] To be honest, not yet. Our main task today is to formulate a relevant and dynamic action program for the CPCZ. The new Presidium now includes not only experienced politicians but also representatives of specific professions and various sections of society. For example, there is Antonin Mlady, a team leader from the CKD plants. There is the writer Miroslav Valek, recently elected chairman of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union. And there is Jozef Cirek, chairman of the integrated agricultural cooperative "Mir-Chelcice" near the city of Strakonice.

[Kornilov] Tell us a little about yourself, please.

[Benda] I was born into a sculptor's family in Prague in 1925. I became a CPCZ member in 1945. I graduated from the electrical engineering faculty of the Prague Higher Technical College, where I am now head of department. From 1951 to 1955 I was a postgraduate student at the power industry institute in Moscow. I have maintained my links with my Soviet friends since then. For example, I am chairman of the joint scientific technical council of Leningrad's "Elektrosila" and Prague's CKD. I make no secret of the fact that I am a fervent supporter of your perestroyka.

[Kornilov] I didn't see a single anti-Soviet slogan anywhere during the rallies and demonstrations.

[Benda] Yes, I agree: There have been no attacks on the USSR. However, I don't rule out the possibility that some people do harbor such feelings, but are simply hiding them.

"The crisis that the party and society are experiencing is the result primarily of serious errors made by the former KSC leadership, such as inconsistency, half-hearted measures and resistance to fundamental changes, and an unwillingness to look reality in the face," he said.

"The Czechoslovak Communist Party and its leadership could rest on laurels because the party had no opponent. It created conditions for political isolation and gave up the political struggle for its prestige and the right to administer the country.

"The KSC rested content as the leading force in society. Its lethargy and administrative-bureaucratic approach to problems resulted in actions against the public demonstrations by security forces, particularly on November 17.

"As a result, the party lost credibility with a large proportion of the population, primarily young people who were the first to come out against this style of thinking and demanded changes in society."

Urbanek touched upon the provisions of the KSC action programme that was adopted by the Presidium of the party's Central Committee.

The programme states that the present party leadership dissociates itself from former KSC policy and gives an objective evaluation of the past, including the events of 1968-1969.

"The Czechoslovak Communist Party is beginning to act in fundamentally new conditions. It is essential to develop beneficial cooperation between the parties and organisations of the National Front in the countryside.

"It is precisely the countryside that may serve as a school of political tolerance and of the ability to conduct dialogue and find joint solutions.

"Speakers at the congress talked about the need to create a new political paty to defend the interests of farmers and rural population.

"I must state that the KSC is fully able to perform this social function. Irrespective of whether a new party comes into being or not, the care for the countryside will always be the focus of attention for the KSC," Urbanek said.

CPCZ Presidium's Appeal to Communists Reported

LD0212154389 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 2 Dec 89

Prague December 2 TASS—The RUDE PRAVO newspaper carries today "An Appeal to All Members and Alternate Members of the Czechoslovak Communist Party" by the party's Central Committee Presidium.

The document said that less than a week ago the Central Committee decided to convene an extraordinary congress. The date of the congress—January 26, 1990—was set as well.

However, communists believe that the congress should be convened earlier. This demand is quite justified.

Recent developments show that if the party does not want to lose its political influence on the processes underway in society, a new functioning Central Committee must be created. A programme of actions to shape the major directions of party policy under qualitatively new conditions must be adopted as soon as possible.

The Czechoslovak Communist Party has abolished its monopoly on power. It will now act differently.

It must become a modern political party conducting its policy in the interests of working people and proceeding from creative use of Leninist principles and norms, the appeal stressed.

In accordance with the Communist Party Central Committee's resolution, the Central Committee Presidium has offered a draft programme of the Communist Party's action for discussion within the party, at district and regional party conferences and in the press.

The draft programme will be discussed at all primary party organisations. Proposals and remarks will be submitted to the party's Central Committee.

Conferences, to be held within the framework of preparations for the extraordinary congress, will take place simultaneously—district conferences will occur on December 9 or 10 and regional on December 16 or 17.

The conferences will discuss the draft programme, decide upon further activities of district and regional party organisations before the extraordinary congress and elect congress delegates.

The soonest meeting of the party's Central Committee will be asked to change the date of the congress.

CPCZ 'Draft Action Program' Reported

LD0412100889 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 3 TASS—The RUDE PRAVO newspaper has published the Czechoslovak Communist Party (KSC) draft action program for both party and nationwide discussion.

"The causes of the current developments are in people's deep dissatisfaction with the bureaucratic distortions of socialism," the draft program says.

"The citizens of Czechoslovakia with great hopes welcomed the ideas of restructuring society, which were first developed by the Soviet Communist Party and which are associated with Mikhail Gorbachev's activities.

"However, the former Czechoslovak Communist Party leadership, which in words assured its commitment to democratisation and dialogue, in actual fact remained inconsistent in the realisation of these major principles of society's life.

[Kornilov] You have just been subjected to 3 hours' "bombardment," as it were, from students in a large faculty auditorium. I was there in the hall. In my view, that was a real public debate, a dialogue. And a respectful one. I liked, for example, the rule laid down by the students that to show disagreement with an academician they shouldn't shout or stamp their feet but simply raise both hands...

[Benda] Perhaps you noticed that at times I, too, raised my hands.

[Kornilov] Yes. Some people disagreed with you on some things and there were things you disagreed on, but at the end they gave you a long ovation. The audience put the following questions among others: What is your attitude toward the events of 17 November? Why is the president of the republic silent at such an acute moment? And another point: Several people laughed loudly at the comment that the CPCZ contains the best people in the country. Could you briefly repeat for IZVESTIYA's readers your answers to those questions?

[Benda] I resolutely condemn the intervention by the public order forces in the 17 November events. The Central Committee termed their actions a big political mistake, but pardon me for saying that I expressed myself to the students in stronger terms than that. As for the president of the CSSR, I think that he himself will decide when to address the people. Now the point about the laughter: Yes, I am convinced that the CPCZ should bring together the best and most able people, because it is with them that we will be able once more to become the leading force in society, in fact.

Ceaucescu Says Economic Ties With USSR 'Secure'

PM0112111589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Bucharest, 29 Nov—Romanian-Soviet economic cooperation has good prospects and a secure future. This was said today by N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) and president of Romania, during his working visit to the 23 August Plant in Bucharest and to a number of other industrial enterprises in the republic's capital. He stressed that the country's largest machine-building enterprise, the 23 August Plant, which does a great deal to strengthen ties between the Soviet Union and Romania, could serve as an example of fruitful cooperation.

The Romanian leader was accompanied on this visit by a large group of foreign correspondents accredited in Romania, who came here to cover the 14th RCP Congress.

RCP Central Committee To Meet 12 Dec

LD0212132189 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 2 TASS—The Political Executive Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) Central Committee met here for the first time after the 14th Congress of the RCP under the chairmanship of party leader Nicolae Ceausescu.

The Political Executive Committee decided to convene a plenary meeting of the RCP Central Committee on December 12 of this year, and elected a permanent bureau consisting of Nicolae Ceausescu, Constantin Dascalescu, Elena Ceausescu, Manea Manescu, Gheorghe Radalescu, Emil Bobu, Gheorghe Oprea and Ion Dinca.

The committee mapped out measures to implement the decisions of the party's 14th congress, discussed a draft socioeconomic development plan and a draft state budget for 1990.

The drafts are to be submitted for endorsement to the Grand National Assembly of Romania. The committee also discussed other economic matters.

As far as the international activities of the party and the state are concerned, the Political Executive Committee emphasised the importance and usefulness of holding a number of regional conferences as well as an international conference to discuss problems that are of concern to socialist countries and to communist and workers' parties.

Those present were addressed by Nicolae Ceausescu.

Reportage on 14th Romanian Party Congress

PRAVDA Summarizes Congress

PM2911125589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[V. Vedrashko and Ye. Spekhov dispatch: "The Congress Concludes Its Work"]

[Text] The 14th Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Congress concluded its work today in Bucharest. For 5 days, the 3,308 delegates, representing almost 4 million Romanian Communists, discussed the results of the past period, the most important questions of socialist building, and plans for the future. A total of 554 delegates from all districts in the country and representatives of various professions and social strata made speeches at the plenary sessions and in the sections.

The congress approved the RCP Central Committee's report and the Central Auditing Commission's report, and adopted the directive program for the socioeconomic development of Romania for 1991-1995 and in the longterm until 2000-2010. Bearing in mind the importance of the resolutions of the party Central Committee plenum on ideological questions, which took

place in October this year, the congress acknowledged them as the party's program on ideological, theoretical, and political-educational work. The validity of the program extends to the next congress.

A new party Central Committee was elected. The general secretary of the RCP is again N. Ceausescu. At the plenum of the Central Committee that was held the Political Executive Committee was elected and the Central Committee Secretariat was formed.

The congress has been concluded. One of its most important results was that loyalty to the chosen socialist path was reaffirmed. The delegates expressed confidence that what has been outlined by the congress will be implemented, and the country will make new advances in economic and cultural development.

In the next 5-year plan, the stress will be on intensive development of the economy and attaining a new quality of work and life. It is planned that the volume of industrial production will be increased by 30-35 percent. This increase, the congress said, must be considered the minimum. In the new 5-year plan a target of at least 50 million tonnes of grain annually will be set. An important task is constructing 700,000 apartments in 5 years.

The foreign policy of the RCP and the Romanian state for strengthening peace and the security of the peoples was unanimously supported at the congress. The readiness to strengthen and develop mutually beneficial economic links with the USSR and other CEMA countries, and cooperation within the Warsaw Pact was expressed.

A rally devoted to the conclusion of the congress and involving many thousands of people was held today in Bucharest. Its delegates are leaving for their towns and villages, and are returning to their labor collectives. Work awaits them.

Congress Resolution Summarized

PM0112144189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Vedrashko dispatch: "Congress Resolution"]

[Text] Bucharest, 30 Nov—The Romanian press publishes the Resolution of the 14th Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Congress today. It says in part that the establishment of the first state of workers and peasants in the USSR, the espousal of the road of socialism by other nations, and their great achievements in socioeconomic development demonstrate the great strength of socialism and its creative potential.

One of the sections of the resolution—there are 18 in all—is devoted to the party's ideological and political education work. The Congress stresses the need for a closer study and theoretical interpretation of the new social phenomena on the basis of practical experience of building socialism.

The document's international section expresses the desire of the RCP and the Romanian Socialist Republic to continue to conduct a peace-loving foreign policy and to develop and improve cooperation with socialist countries.

Possible 'Forcible' Repatriation of Comaneci Seen

PM0112160989 Moscow TRUD in Russian 1 Dec 89 p 3

[Dispatch by unnamed own correspondent: "Where Is Nadia Comaneci?"]

[Text] Budapest, 30 Nov—On Tuesday Nadia Comaneci, the well-known Romanian sportswoman and Olympic gymnastics champion, asked for political asylum in Hungary, as our newspaper has already reported. But today the Hungarian press is conjecturing about her fate: On Wednesday Nadia left the Royal Hotel in the city of Szeged, and no one has seen her since then.

According to police spokesmen, N. Comaneci declared that she wanted to take up permanent residence in Hungary. She obtained the necessary documents from the Szeged Administration for Refugee Affairs.

So why did she leave the hotel, taking her things with her, and, most importantly, where did she go? NEPSZABADSAG writes that she might not have liked the fact that during questioning she was asked questions about her close relationship with the Ceausescu family. It is also believed that the sportswoman might already have moved to some other country. The possibility of her forcible return home is not ruled out either.

According to border guards' reports, N. Comaneci has not yet left Hungary, at any rate not legally.

Outcome of Hungarian Referendum Viewed

PM0112151589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent F. Lukyanov dispatch: "Hungary: Should There Be an Early Election"]

[Text] Budapest—The counting of votes cast by participants in the first nationwide referendum in Hungary's postwar history, in which 58 percent of voters took part, lasted almost 2 days instead of 12 hours as initially expected.

The main outcome of the referendum was that slightly more than one-half of those who took part voted in favor of the republic's president being elected not by the whole people, as agreed at the national "roundtable," but by the country's new parliament which will be formed following general elections on an interparty basis. The winning margin was less than 6,000 votes.

In order to understand the background of the prevailing situation it must be borne in mind that the "roundtable" agreement was not signed by all opposition parties which

took part. Two of them—the Union of Free Democrats [UFD] and the Union of Young Democrats [UYD] whose total membership runs to no more than 10,000—did not accept the accord and soon organized a noisy campaign to collect signatures against direct presidential elections. They succeeded in reaching the rather low threshold set by the Law on Referendums (100,000 certified signatures). This is what brought about the referendum on four questions, the main one being that of presidential elections.

Quite a few explanations were offered for the persistence with which the UFD-UYD strove to amend the presidential elections procedure. The one most frequently cited was a desire to consolidate their positions prior to the parliamentary elections. If the presidential elections were to be held in the near future, public opinion polls indicate that the best chance of victory would be enjoyed by I. Pozsgay whose candidacy, promoted by the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP], is a real "headache" for the right-wing opposition. Its members are unwilling to see a "Communist painted in a different color" as head of state. True enough, the opposition parties are hardly likely to present in the near future a candidate who could compare with Poszgay in terms of fame and popularity. But if the country's president were to be elected by the new parliament, I. Pozsgay's chances would appear slimmer, as he himself admitted following the referendum.

It is important to note that attitudes toward the referendum divided the political forces operating in the country today, spotlighted their positions, and also outlined opportunities for cooperation in the forthcoming election campaign. For example, there was a surprising split in the ranks of the opposition, hitherto operating as a single bloc within the framework of the "Roundtable" Opposition. The left-wing parties—the MSZP and the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] which declared that they would continue acting under the leadership of former General Secretary K. Grosz—took an unambiguous stance against the president being elected by the future parliament, taking the view that early elections for a head of state would guarantee a normal transition to a multiparty system and a model of democratic socialism. The MSZP and MSZMP were supported on this issue by the so-called center parties headed by the Hungarian Democratic Forum [HDF] which called for the referendum to be boycotted altogether, perceiving it as "a trap for the emergent Hungarian democracy."

It is hard to estimate how many voters from the 42 percent who did not vote actually heeded the HDF's call and did not turn up at the polling stations. It seems as if this was mainly an effect of social apathy aggravated by the buildup of economic and social problems which, in my view, the opposition quite successfully utilized in its propaganda campaign just before the referendum.

One possible consequence of the referendum, the topic of particularly persistent talk in the last few days, might be the dissolution of the National Assembly and the scheduling of early parliamentary elections.

Grosz Addresses MSZMP Activists 26 Nov

90UI0152A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 28 Nov 89 p 3

[Text] Budapest, 27 November (TASS)—The Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] congress scheduled for December is to determine the political character of the MSZMP. This was stated by K. Grosz, who addressed a meeting of this party's activists held here on Sunday [26 November]. It is already clear that the forces of the left in Hungary are concentrated in several parties. The Hungarian Socialist Party exists and functions together with the MSZMP. Other political organizations of a leftist persuasion will obviously exist also. But the MSZMF must be the most consistent party of the left calling the tune in this movement, K. Grosz emphasized.

He cited as being among the most important tasks of the upcoming congress the party's unification around a single center, the formulation of a program which is clear-cut and attractive to the working people and the election of a leadership which is up to the tasks confronting it.

The new MSZMP must be a party which is based on Marxist ideology and which advocates the predominant role of public ownership. It must operate within a constitutional framework and in accordance with the law-governing parties. The MSZMP's influence in society will be based on the votes which it is able to win in the course of elections. The MSZMP, the speaker observed, could be Hungary's biggest party, and its strength could perfectly well reach 200,000 members.

K. Grosz advocated the preservation in the MSZMP of the principle of democratic centralism, but emphasized that the accent should be placed on democratic principles. The party must undoubtedly represent the interests of the working class, but it must not be alien to other strata of society either.

It was noted on the question of the party's structure that primary party organizations would be created and that a central committee would function. The primary party organizations could operate at enterprises and at their members' place of residence. It is proposed forming an MSZMP Central Committee of 30-35 persons. The congress will be held in two stages: The first will take place on 17 December; the second, in February 1990. It is anticipated that 500 delegates elected by the primary party organizations will take part in the work of the forum.

According to K. Grosz, the revival of the MSZMP will be a significant event in the transitional period through which Hungary is passing.

PZPR Official Condemns Anti-Soviet Vandalism

LD0312123689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Interview with Wlodzimierz Natorf, Polish United Workers Party (PZPR) Central Committee secretary and former Polish ambassador to the Soviet Union, in Warsaw by correspondent Ashot Nasibov in Moscow Radio studio via telephone line "recently installed" at the PZPR Central Committee building in Warsaw for anyone wanting to put forward opinions and suggestions preceding the party congress; date of interview not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted on correspondent Valdimir Mikhaylenko in Warsaw discussing the upcoming PZPR Congress.]

[Nasibov] Comrade Natorf, I have a question.

[Natorf] Yes?

[Nasibov] Our press occasionally carries reports about outbreaks of anti-Soviet offensives in Poland and desecration of monuments to Lenin and Soviet soldiers. What is the reaction of Polish society to such manifestations?

[Natorf] Yes. Sadly, these things do exist. I'd say, moreover, that their source is—as you are very well aware yourself—of course, our history (?has not been a simple one) and moreover (?there have been grievances on) both sides. And now reactionary forces, right-wing forces, want to exploit this in exciting anti-Soviet feeling, (?chiefly for political considerations). However, I would say that, of course, the people's reaction to this is sometimes that they are greatly offended and critical, because very often it is just hooligans; and vandalism of this sort is not accepted in our society.

And, you know, sometimes there are (?mass media) that represent the right-wing forces and fan these things and shows them in an exaggerated form. On the other hand, I don't think we can believe that nothing of the sort is going on. In the Politburo, for example, we discussed these matters last week and produced a very clear, precise statement that debates these activities. Of course, we will be taking all the necessary measures to put a stop to this, to restrict it. They are extremists, sometimes young people who don't even know what they are doing. [passage omitted]

PZPR's Miller Visits Polish Workers in Kursk

PM0112140089 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[A. Bogomolov report: "Polish Meetings on Kursk Soil: 'Enormous Scope for Cooperation'"]

[Excerpts] Kursk, Moscow—An unremarkable winter day, occasional flurries of snow break through the misty gloom. In the spacious hall of the ultramodern trade center that is under construction, the workers talk with Leszek Miller, member of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee Politburo, who is visiting them. The rapid Polish speech is intermingled now with bursts of laughter, now with a strained silence. This is happening not in Krakow or Czestochowa, but in the small city of Kurchatov in Kursk Oblast. [passage omitted]

Of course, it is not just for the fun of it, or to see the sights of the Kursk region, that the Poles come to Kurchatov. Naturally, working abroad gives many young workers an opportunity to find their feet rapidly.

But serious problems have begun to appear recently, many of which were discussed during the workers' talk with Leszek Miller, who was in Kurchatov for a zonal seminar of secretaries of CPSU oblast committees and PZPR voivodship committees.

"More and more frequently," Wladislaw Adamski, secretary of the PZPR committee of the Polish construction workers in Kurchatov, said, "we are seeing irregularities in deliveries of construction materials, joinery goods, and electrical materials. Furthermore the volume of deliveries to construction sites is declining. This prevents us from working normally."

There is another problem which it is hardly up to the Soviet side to resolve: Because of the rapid growth in prices and index-linking of wages in Poland, the wages of Polish construction workers in the Soviet Union are falling sharply. And the prestige of this work is declining correspondingly.

"The workers," Leszek Miller told SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in an interview, "complained to me about various restrictions, in particular as regards the opportunity to acquire various goods and export them to Poland. They simply find it hard to spend the money they earn here. There are not enough refrigerators, television sets, freezers, cars. And even when you have acquired something, it is extremely difficult to export it to Poland. For instance, they learned only in October that from now on it is prohibited to take cars bought with Soviet rubles abroad. And the Kurchatov Poles now have 15 of these cars."

It is clear that there is no simple solution to this—the situation is directly connected with the position on the domestic market, with its shortages and "black holes." But a solution must be found—you cannot offend people who are working side by side with us and for our benefit, and put them in the position of second-class people. There is an awareness of this: It is no accident that there were representatives of the customs administration among the participants in the Kursk conference.

"The situation in Poland has changed drastically. How far will this affect Soviet-Polish economic relations?"—I asked L. Miller.

"In the future our economies will diverge," he said. "This is because the T. Mazowiecki government's plans include elements of a transition to a capitalist system.

These include, for instance, the privatization of enterprises and the restriction of the role of workers' self-management. Certain difficulties will therefore arise. But I am sure that any restriction on our economic relations would be a serious mistake. We are natural partners, linked by thousands of threads. These must not be broken. It is another matter that we must seek the forms most appropriate to the changing conditions in Poland and the Soviet Union."

V.I. Gusarov, director of the Kursk Nuclear Power Station, is categorically opposed to a reduction in our ties. "If the Poles leave," he said, "we will lose much." [passage omitted]

Gusarov will presumably be satisfied with the statement made by Polish Prime Minister T. Mazowiecki, who recently visited our country, in a conversation with M.S. Gorbachev: "Now that the problem of normalizing the economy and becoming actively involved in the system of world economic ties has become particularly relevant for both countries, the Polish Government attaches particularly great significance to maintaining and developing mutually beneficial Soviet-Polish economic cooperation, improving its mechanism, and increasing its effectiveness."

The same point was made by the Polish premier during talks with his Soviet colleague N.I. Ryzhkov. Regardless of the political changes, the USSR and Poland remain natural, organically-linked partners.

Jaruzelski Chairs Defense Committee Session

LD0212230589 Moscow TASS in English 2139 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Warsaw December 3 TASS—A meeting of the Polish Defence Committee chaired by Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski was held on Saturday to discuss the Polish military doctrine and major tasks to ensure the country's defensive capacity.

The meeting noted that the doctrine is defence-oriented. Its content will be made public after the doctrine is completed.

The meeting was attended by the Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki and other members of the Polish Government.

Greetings to SFRY Government, Party Leaders

PM3011170189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers undated greeting to Yugoslav leaders on Republic Day]

[Text] To Comrade Janez Drnovsek, president of the SFRY Presidency

Comrade Milan Pancevski, president of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia [LCY] Central Committee Presidium

Comrade Ante Markovic, president of the SFRY Federal Executive Council

Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers send cordial greetings on behalf of the Soviet people to you, the LCY Central Committee, the SFRY Presidency and Federal Executive Council, and the fraternal SFRY peoples and ethnic groups on the occasion of your national holiday, Republic Day.

On this memorable day we note with gratification the fruitful development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations along all avenues, the mutual will and readiness to deepen the constant political dialogue and to boost efforts for the attainment of a new quality in multifaceted and mutually advantageous cooperation. The similarity between the tasks of perestroyka in the USSR and the course of renewal of socialist self-management in the SFRY and the respectful attitude toward the specifics of their solution in each country promote the growth of mutual interest in the exchange of experience. The principles and provisions contained in the 1988 Soviet-Yugoslav declaration and other joint documents provide a reliable basis for strengthening collaboration in various spheres.

Yugoslavia plays an active part in developing the all-European process and shaping civilized relations on the planet. The election of the SFRY as chairman of the Nonaligned Movement expands the opportunities for its constructive contribution to the creation of a new international community free of wars and violence.

We wish you, Dear Comrades, and the communists and all working people of the SFRY success in implementing the planned program of reforms and in preparing for and holding the 14th LCY Congress, as well as happiness and prosperity.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee
The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
The USSR Council of Ministers

Yazov Greets SFRY Counterpart on Republic Day

PM0112105189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Text] To Colonel General Comrade Veljko Kadijevic, SFRY Federal Secretary for National Defense

Esteemed Comrade Federal Secretary!

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own behalf I send you and all Yugoslav People's Army servicemen ardent greetings and the most cordial congratulations on Yugoslavia's national holiday—Republic Day.

We note with profound satisfaction that the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation linking our peoples and armies are currently being filled with new content and are developing for the good of peace and socialism.

I wish all Yugoslav servicemen further successes in improving their combat skills in the interests of strengthening the SFRY's defense capability.

[Signed] Army General D. Yazov, USSR defense minister

Macedonian Council Delegation Arrives in Moscow

LD0312192789 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1723 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 3 December (TANJUG)—Gligorie Gogovski, president of the Macedonian Executive Council, arrived in Moscow this afternoon at the head of a republican delegation which will spend several days in the USSR.

The delegation will visit, besides Moscow, Tashkent, and it is expected that it will also stay in Zaporozhye, Samarkand, and other Soviet cities.

During the visit the delegation will hold talks, above all, on the development of cooperation, especially in the economic sphere—in this way enriching overall cooperation between Yugoslavia and the USSR.

SFRY Economic, Political Problems Viewed

PM3011114989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Vostrukhov dispatch: "Yugoslavia: Difficult Path of Reform"]

[Text] Belgrade—The SFRY's cities and villages have donned their traditionally modest holiday garb. Today—29 November—is the birthday of the new federative people's Yugoslavia. The years and decades have flown by, new generations have been born, but the people have not forgotten the events of the terrible and glorious years of antifascist struggle. On the contrary, today—when Yugoslav society is experiencing a most acute crisis, when many people are asking in alarm: How can we protect the federation against disintegration?—the events of those far-off years assume particular significance and help contemporaries resolve current problems.

Today two striped flags, one from the six union republics and the SFRY flag, and alongside them a red banner with a five-pointed star fly together in every Yugoslav city and village. People in Yugoslavia have not forgotten what the red banner awash with blood means to them.

Yugoslavia was the first socialist country to embark on the path of reform, of improving production relations, and the quest for a humane look to socialism. These have brought society good changes. In the sixties steps were taken to improve industrial management and restrict "state monopolism" in many spheres. The union republics obtained greater independence in connection with the decentralization of management and investment policy. Industry was extensively modernized and foreign technology and equipment were purchased with foreign credits. But negative phenomena also gradually built up over the years: The foreign debt increased and republic and local bureacracy replaced central bureaucracy.

The federal government headed by A. Markovic is displaying enviable determination in implementing radical reform in the economy and in financial and tax policy and recognizing equal rights for all types of ownership. The government has been in power since last March. In this time it has not deviated for a single day from its program for emerging from the crisis. The first results have already been achieved: The decline in social production has finally stopped, the country's hard-currency reserves have increased, and its short-term debts have been reduced. The equalization of public and private ownership rights has appreciably boosted entrepreneurial initiative, and thousands of "private" enterprises in industry and the service sphere have opened up throughout the country over the last few months. The government has taken steps to intensively import goods from abroad, from Japan and West Europe, to create healthy competition on the internal market. At the same time, exports are being given every encouragement and enterprises are being encouraged to trade on the external market.

Foreign partners are now more willing to embark on cooperation with Yugoslavs; joint industrial and service ventures are being set up and there has been a marked increase in foreign investment in various sectors of the economy. All the same, there are still many barriers in the way of the Yugoslav reforms. Perhaps the main one is the continuing headlong inflation, which is expected to "top" 2,000 percent by the end of the year. VJESNIK recently published a table showing the change in the prices of basic food products in comparison with the beginning of February. Well? The average price increase in this short time was 1,147.8 percent! Inflation, notwithstanding the compensation mechanism, has a severe effect on the material position of literally every family.

Indisputably, national strife, particularly in Kosovo, is holding up the progress of the reforms. But of late many people have become concerned about the unity of the federation: Contrary to public opinion, the Slovenian Provincial Assembly ratified a number of constitutional amendments in contravention of the federal constitution. This disparity is currently being studied by the SFRY Constitutional Court, which will produce its findings in early December.

A. Markovic's cabinet does not have very many assistants. Economic and financial reforms cannot be implemented successfully without changing the political system or while leaving "for later" the democratization of society and the establishment of broad pluralism of

views, tolerance of alternative trends, and so on. The LCY also seems to be lagging behind in carrying out reforms within its own ranks. The Yugoslav press points out that the LCY has markedly tended to break up into individual republic detachments upholding national interests. Everyone is awaiting hopefully the 14th (Extraordinary) LCY Congress, to be held in Belgrade in the second half of next January. Working people ask reasonably: "Who but Communists should set an example of unity of action and forgo narrow interests for the sake of the interests of the entire country? Will you really become stronger on your own?"

The national holiday is here and Yugoslavs regard the future with restrained optimism. They expect changes for the better in the coming year. The government has firmly promised to halt and then curb inflation, secure reductions in prices using economic levers, and raise the population's standard of living.

Soviet-Albanian Friendship Meeting Held

LD2911144489 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 29 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 29 TASS—The Soviet-Albanian Friendship Society held a meeting today to mark the 45th anniversary of Albania's liberation from fascism and the victory of the people's revolution. The public figures wished the Albanian people success in building socialism and expressed confidence that resumption of equal and mutually-advantageous cooperation between the two countries will benefit both peoples.

West Europe

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Italy

Meets Milan Enterpreneurs

AU0212162789 Rome ANSA in English 1038 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] (ANSA) Milan, Dec 2—The agreements signed with Italian industry during Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's three-day visit here indicate the determination of the Soviet Union to integrate itself into the world economic system while maintaining its own identity, said the Kremlin leader here Friday [1 December].

Addressing the leading lights of Italian business and finance, Gorbachev also called for, "a new foundation for the world economy" and "a true international market free of exceptions and discrimination."

Gorbachev was welcomed to Italy's industrial capital in the afternoon by a large and enthusiastic crowd at Malpensa Airport, where he and his delegation arrived on a flight from Rome. Echoing the warm and sometimes boisterous reception the Soviet leader received in Rome wherever he travelled, following his arrival Wednesday (29 November], people here lined the route from the airport to Milan and massed at the City Hall Building, Palazzo Marino.

Flying up with him were Italian Premier Giulio Andreotti and Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis.

The guest of honor was welcomed to the city by Mayor Paolo Pillitteri, who proposed that Gorbachev should be nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Later in the day, Gorbachev, accompanied by Andreotti and State Industries Minister Carlo Francanzani and the president of Italy's association of private-sector industrialists, Confindustria's Sergio Pininfarino, went to Castle Sforzesco for a meeting with the nation's leading industrial figures.

In his speech to the assembly, the Soviet president said he felt that "you would agree that it is easier to reach an agreement on practical issues if there is mutual understanding on the more general issues." He went on to affirm that, "a natural state" in which universal human values and mutual and global security would prevail "would be unthinkable without new foundation for the world economy, without a true market free of exceptions and discrimination."

The economic globalization process under way is, he said, "still conducted in the forms inherited from the postwar period, the approaching end of which we are witness." His words, he said, were not spoken in reproof but referred to, "the existing reality determined by the lack of maturity and of preparedness in some parts of the contemporary world to take part in world economic integration. There is policy which seriously hinders economic relations among various countries."

Speaking of his own country, Gorbachev said that with perestroyka, the Soviet Union "has contributed to the transformation of the world" and that this economic restructurization "will be put at the service of the normalization of world economic development," for the good of the Soviet Union "and in the interests of all."

After noting that, "paradoxically, the removal of ideology from international relations is sometimes more simple in the political sphere than in the economic realm," the Kremlin leader referred to genuine doubts in the West on the prospects of the perestroika path pursued by Soviet authorities.

"We will deal with our own problems, though this will not be easy or quick," he said and insisted that there is no turning back from this policy. Summarizing the goals of Moscow's economic recovery policy, he named restoring health to finances, the creation of a complete internal market, the application of new economic laws and the convertibility of the ruble and added, "we want to take part in world economic organizations."

He went on to thank Italian authorities who, he said, "understand our motives and attempt to provide their own contribution."

In this connection, Gorbachev referred to foreign trade and the difficulties associated with the Soviet bureaucracy, delays in the development of infrastructure, shortcomings in experience.

In the area of agreements with Italy, he cited, "accords of a totally new character on supplying Italy with electrical power and the participation of Italian firms in the reconstruction of our electric generating stations, the foundation in the Soviet Union of an agro-industrial complex and the construction of plants for nonferrous metallurgy."

Looking to the broader picture and "the formation of a truly world market," the leader said the first step might be "the establishment of a mechanism for consultations among the European Community, the European Free Trade Association and Comecon." He also spoke of convening a forum on cooperation in the Mediterranean, including the Black Sea area "because no country linked to the Mediterranean must suffer damages from the economic consolidation of Europe."

Nearing the end of his statement, Gorbachev focussed on ecological issues and acknowledged that, "some areas of the Soviet Union have become ecological calamity areas" and referred to intentions to "start up closer cooperation with Italy in this sector."

"The slogan 'back to nature' is sterile," he added and suggested, "Forward towards nature, towards a new relationship between man and the environment."

On the much-discussed issue of converting Soviet military industries to civil production, Gorbachev said the work has begun and "is a complex process which involves many sectors in the life of society. The cost will not be small but, in the future, the advantages will be enormous and multiple. We applaud the understanding for the formation of a Soviet-Italian work group for joint research" in this area, he said.

"When the cold war is ended," he concluded on the eve of his talks with American President George Bush heralded as marking the end of the cold war, "the international economy will have to play its own and irreplaceable role in the perestroyka of international relations. Mars and Mercury (the ancient Roman gods of war and commerce, ed.), rivals since ancient times, must take the places reserved for them in the new era. Mars in the museum and Mercury in the arena of the formation of new relations among men, nations, states and continents."

Commenting on Gorbachev's speech, the dean of Italian entrepreneurs, Fiat Group Chairman Gianni Agnelli, said the Soviet leader was "totally convincing. Gorbachev is to be admired. With all the problems he has to settle now, he even finds time to concern himself with small and medium size industries and tourism."

Among the others heaping praise on the guest and his remarks were real estate and commercial television magnate Silvio Berlusconi, Leopoldo Pirelli of the Pirelli Tyle and Cable Multinational, Raul Gardini, the chairman of the Ferruzzi Agro-Industrial Giant and Entrepreneur Carlo de Benedetti the chairman of the business machines and computer manufacturer Olivetti.

The chairman of the state holding company colossus IRK, Franco Nobili, declared that the Soviet Leader's presence in Milan was "a worthy frame for what is happening in Eastern Europe under Gorbachev's direction."

PRAVDA on Meeting With Businessmen

PM0412114789 Moscow PRAVDA Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Let Us Remain Pioneers at the New Stage of Cooperation. M.S. Gorbachev Answers Italian Businessmen's Questions."]

[Text] As has been reported, on 1 December, the final day of his visit to Italy, M.S. Gorbachev met here with representatives of business and financial circles. After his speech he answered questions.

"What we are talking about today would have been totally unthinkable a year or 2 ago. It is difficult now probably even to foresee what we will be doing together in a year or 2 from now. I think that there is no need to sketch plans. It is necessary to proceed step by step and arrange real cooperation. There will surely be many and varied forms of this cooperation—joint enterprises and participation in share capital, and there will be cooperation in new forms to make use of scientific achievements, and there will be new forms of cooperation for work in third countries, and so on. I won't enumerate.

"But there are questions which occur to you, and I would simply like to express perhaps my preliminary view of them. The first question I understood to touch on what we think about the successful activities of state enterprises in Italy.

The experience of these enterprises, this sector of the Italian economy, was of interest to us since these were state enterprises operating within the framework of private enterprise. And In so far as our reform is moving in the direction of greater independence and expanding the rights of enterprises, moving on to new forms of functioning, then this experience is very interesting for us. The fact that IZVESTIYA has published the first articles about this experience of the operation of Italian state enterprises is a reflection of our interest. We will study this experience. It is very interesting to us.

"The second question is a very interesting one. What is your opinion—are joint banks possible? I must say that we now understand better than a year ago, and much better than 2 years ago, that we will not be able to ensure the dynamic functioning of our economy, using various forms of ownership, forms of economic management,

using market mechanisms, if we do not expand the network of institutions for resolving financial and credit operations and bank operations. This is simply unthinkable. Otherwise the government will have to undertake all of these questions, which should normally be done by the bank or banks. So, we have entered upon the path of expanding the credit and banking system, particularly commercial banks. I think that within the framework of this policy which we are implementing, the experience of setting up joint banks is possible. Let us conduct a search here, too, and accumulate experience, experience of cooperation. Comrade Sitaryan our deputy premier—he is a academician, and economics have been his sphere of interest throughout his life—has sent me a note that the first step has already been taken, even though it is quite a modest step. A Moscow bank has been set up with foreign participation. Before my visit to Italy, in fact, we received news about the possibility of setting up a European bank which would serve economic links of a new sort at the present stage. We received this news from Paris, but we also heard about this here in Italy, too. We regard this idea positively. In principle I think that since links are developing, there is a need for new instruments for serving these new links. I think I have answered the second question.

"There is a very interesting question about the possibilities for cooperation in the interests of tourism. This problem is already being discussed in our country. We must determine our position on this. The potential of our country in this area could be unlimited. When we announced summer vacation cruises in the Arctic Ocean, straight away a line formed for several years ahead of those wishing to go on this cruise. I understand that you would find a way of reducing this line. You would set a price which would reduce it by 10 or a 100-fold, and then you would gradually reduce it. But that is just a small illustration.

"But we are discussing the following aspect of this problem: It should be organically integrated in the first instance—and there must be this priority—with the interests of expanding tourist services for Soviet people. This will occupy first place. Some of you have already raised your eyebrows in amazement. But I think that you will understand that what I am saying is correct. If for us economic policy was simply a policy of increasing capital, it would not be our policy. Our economic policy has as its aim the satisfying of people's interests. And if we speak of the economic policy of the Soviet Government, then we must give priority to the Soviet people. I think nonetheless, that is no obstacle to participation in the development of the basis and the infrastructure of tourism. Moreover, such links already exist and they show interesting achievements. One must not forget the ecological aspect, of course. In short, let us think together about this highly promising sphere of cooperation.

"The two final addresses contained the same question: What is the government thinking about doing to stimulate links between medium-sized and small enterprises and our enterprises in the USSR. We have a very great interest in ensuring that in the very near future the necessary organizational, economic and legal mechanisms are found so that this process should be put firmly on its feet and even be given a certain priority.

"Mr Agnelli is no longer interested in this question. He already knows how to break through onto this market, and he is doing quite well. We salute him and the other "pioneers"—I am not going to list them all. But I think that we have much to give thought to together so that medium-sized and small firms should get organically involved in Soviet-Italian cooperation. We must take the necessary decisions. I would like to assure you that we are optimistic and that we are working on all of these problems. I think that our Chamber of Commerce, within which an association of businessmen has been set up and is already functioning, should perhaps set up a joint working group to elaborate these mechanisms which would provide greater incentive to cooperation in this area.

"I have replied to all the questions. I am grateful that there were not too many. After all, I am a politician and not an economist, even though the economy has always been a subject of my primary interests. I would like to express satisfaction with this meeting. Thank you, Mr Prime Minister, thank you gentlemen, representatives of Italian industry, who made possible this meeting, which is a logical component of the talks, on issues of economic cooperation which have taken place here.

"We, together with you, were the pioneers in arranging lively economic links between East and West. I would like us to remain pioneers now, when these economic links are being transformed into a new stage and new forms, more complex, more interesting, but also more promising from the point of view of final results—economic results, too, but also and importantly, political, human, and social results. Therefore, I once again invite you to remain in this position of pioneers.

"I would feel awkward if even at this business meeting, which in general concludes our program, the program of the visit, if I did not say, speaking of the whole of Italy, the Italian people, that we are satisfied with the results of the visit. Mr Andreotti and I will be saying this to the press. I hope that we will be going together, that we will be conducting a joint venture in the spirit, so to speak, of Soviet-Italian cooperation. But, nonetheless, before the representatives of the Italian people I would like to utter words of sincere gratitude and thanks for the atmosphere of warmth and cordiality displayed by the Italians, which greatly promoted the success of this visit.

"That is the first thing, but I would be wrong if I did not single out Milan. This is the first time I have been to Milan, although I know a lot about this city and the contribution that the Milanese have made to history and to civilization, and not just European but also world human civilization. But I also know that Milan is a city of banks and businessmen, and this is also the visage of Milan, its role, its specific and unique character, not to

mention that Milan is also a city of art, triumph of the spirit and culture. I would like to say that I have been simply stunned by the welcome I have been given in Milan by the inhabitants, the citizens of Milan, and I do not even know what to say about that. Simply, it has been a tremendous impression and I thank them for these feelings.

"I think that this is evidence of the empathy they feel for the great, perhaps difficult, very difficult and painful matters which we are tackling in the USSR, the empathy and the support of the Milanese for our affairs. I think that Soviet people recognize the true worth of this good will shown by the Milanese. Here in this hall I bid farewell to the Italians and to Italy. Until we meet again, and I hope, until you and I meet again soon. Thank you." [applause]

Speech to Italian Businessmen

PM0412113589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report on speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to a gathering of Italian businessmen in Milan's town hall on 1 December 1989: "M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Italy"]

[Text] Esteemed Mr Chairman!
Ladies and gentlemen!

You are business people, but I think you will agree that it is easier to come to an agreement in practical affairs if there is mutual understanding in more general matters. The scale of the problems and the pace of change are now such that this kind of understanding is particularly desirable. The world has begun moving toward a new era in which common human values will be dominant and where universal and mutual security will be a natural state. However, such a state is unthinkable without a new world-economic basis, without a genuine world market with no exceptions or discrimination.

The process of globalization of economic life, of economic integration, is already taking place, but so far in forms inherited from the postwar period, which is coming to an end before our very eyes. I do not say this by way of reproach; it is an acknowledgement of reality, an acknowledgement that results objectively from, in particular, the immaturity or unreadiness of individual parts of today's world to participate in contemporary world-economic interaction. However, this is not the whole truth: There is also a policy that seriously hampers economic relations between different countries. Moreover, it intentionally obstructs equality and mutual benefit in economic ties with specific states. You understand what I am refering to.

Through restructuring in the USSR, we have made our contribution to changing the political situation in the world. We also want to place it at the service of normalizing global economic development, to our own benefit of course, but also in the interests of all. everyone Probably understands that the market of a country such as the USSR is enormous, and the new Soviet market which restructuring is ushering in, all the more so.

The experience of the past, indeed the experience of restructuring, has already shown us that the full-blooded development of the Soviet national economy dictates the necessity of organic incorporation into global economic contacts. We have already begun this. However, it is a paradox but a fact that the deideologization of international relations proceeds at times more easily in the political than in the economic sphere. Evidently, fears as to the incompatibility of socialist and capitalist economics are exerting their influence.

However, this is not the whole story. Alongside the expression of support for our restructuring, and wishes for its success, we hear other voices in the West, too, sometimes from the same people. they say one has yet to see what the Soviet leadership will achieve. Will everything in the USSR start rolling backwards? So there is no need to rush with real support, one need not get too tied up, it's better to bide one's time.

On this point I will say this: We will cope with our problems, although this will not be easy nor happen quickly. Restructuring will take place. In any case—there is no going back. Indeed, objectively, this is already impossible. Our society is transformed to such an extent that it will only look for a path forward. In principle, we already know this path and are harnessing the resources to advance along it.

As far as the differences between socialist and capitalist economics are concerned, these do indeed exist. However, it is not true that these economic systems are, as it were, in principle incompatible in some kind of integrated mechanism of the world economy.

The leading historical tendency consists in rapprochement, rather than divergence, of varying economic structures. Let us take the question of the market. After all, none of the capitalist countries now have a "pure" market economy; to varying degrees it is always combined with state regulation. Both the structure of ownership and the level of state intervention in the economy are by no means the same, even in the countries which are members of the European Community. As for the socialist countries, most of them, and the USSR, of course, have embarked on the path of developing market relations, competition, and the use of diverse forms of ownership. We have realized the harm of monopolism in all spheres, including foreign economic spheres, and we are resolute in moving away from it, although this process is not easy.

Interdependence makes it posible for all of us to overcome the degree of disconnection in the world. The world economy is in need of an equilibrium of a kind which it has not yet known. In the past this was perhaps unattainable. However, now it is only on the basis of mutual complementary actions that it is possible to

achieve genuine equilibrium and to make the interdependence not so much stable as truly mutually beneficial.

This is why we strive to take part in the activity of international economic organizations. We understand that so far we are not yet fully ready for this. We are facing many tasks that are waiting to be tackled: From improving our finances, creating a fully fledged domestic market and introducing new economic laws into practice, to the convertibility of the ruble. We value the position of the Italian leadership which understands our motives and strives to assist us in this cause.

I wish to say a few words about our perestroyka. Our economic reform has now reached a watershed. This is a difficult but hope- inspiring stage. We are trying with resolve to break the administrative-bureaucratic system, but this is proving not so simple, and one can make a mess of things when acting on impulse, as our saying goes.

The old system must be replaced by another system. It cannot be created by edict from above. It takes time. New cadres are needed, new connections, and new mechanisms. As yet the two systems are coexisting, as it were, and it must be admitted that this is far from peaceful coexistence. To the difficulties of a period of transition are added the flaws of past years, which have burst out into the open: Financial disorder, and the unbalanced state of the market. The government has worked out a series of measures to, first, provide the population with the basic essentials. However, we are endeavoring to carry out even the urgent measures while still not losing sight of the needs of the years to come. This also applies to the plan for 1990 recently adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Of course a mass of purely practical difficulties exists in our external economic affairs. Many of them, and we understand this, have been caused by deficiencies on our part which everyone is aware of: Bureaucracy, backwardness in developing the infrastructure, shortage of skilled specialists, lack of skills and experience in international commerce, and so on. We are seeking solutions and are trying to give them normative form—to put the new laws on a firm footing and ensure that everyone knows better than to break them. This, you understand, will create additional guarantees for our foreign partners as well. At the same time we consider that the actual practice of cooperation must play an important part in overcoming the dificiencies. Such difficulties should not discourage us. They can perfectly well be surmounted, if there is, moreover, a constructive, albeit critical, attitude and understanding on your part.

The way we approach the matter is this: External economic ties should help us not only to replenish our market today, but also to create a serious head start for the future.

What is under discussion are fundamentally new contracts for example, the supply to Italy of Soviet electricity, and the involvement of Italian companies in the reconstruction of our power stations; the setting up in the USSR of agro-industrial complexes and nonferrous metallurgy works. One of the contracts is already being called one of the largest deals of the late 20th century—this is the establishment, jointly with Fiat, of a vehicle works in Yelabuga. I note with satisfaction that the agreements signed over these days meet the highest requirements, and I hope will bring due advantage to the Italians, too. I want to note in particular that the Italian entrepreneurs and our commercial and industrial organizations were and still remain pioneers.

We in the USSR have not forgotten that the first major contracts with Western Europe in the postwar years received their start in life here in Milan. It is no coincidence that the Italo-Soviet Chamber of Commerce—the first chairman of which, Franco Marinotti, exerted no little effort and imagination to ensure that economic relations between our countries set off on a good path—was born here.

The vehicle giants in the city of Tolyatti and Naberezhnyye Chelny, built with Italian involvement, became for Soviet people distinctive symbols of effective economic cooperation with the West. You and we were the first to pave the way to cooperation in deliveries of Soviet gas to the West. You and we were the first to pave the way to cooperation in deliveries of Soviet gas to the West. We observe that the Italians are responding to our new foreign economic policy more actively than many others. In our turn, for us in the USSR, a—I would say—heightened receptiveness to the Italian experience in production and trade has long been established.

The system of joint ventures, industrial joint production, scientific and technical contacts, can gradually become integrated.

How do we imagine the long term? This means cooperation in the development and application of the latest scientific-technical achievements. In our science there are a number of powerful and original developments and even more ideas. This means the organization of joint production of innovative products, both in the USSR and in Italy. It means the establishment of joint ventures of a fundamentally new kind, facilitating a drive into the future, the harnessing of 21st Century equipment and technology.

Our new legislation will facilitate this. The draft law on ownership legalizes, for instance, the creation of joint-stock societies, including societies with mixed capital. Legislation on the protection of foreign investment, on competition, on the rules of foreign trade turnover and on taxation etc. is being brought into line with world standards. We will bring our system of statistical indicators up to the level of comparability with international systems. Up until recently our partners in Italy were mainly major companies and state institutions; good

relations have been established with Italian cooperative organizations, with the league of cooperatives. Clearly, we will also continue to develop relations with our old acquaintances. At the same time, there are partners whose capabilities we underestimated until recently: Medium and small firms. They have forged ahead strongly in the economy and in technical progress in the West, Italy included. We know that many of them have an interest in ties with the USSR.

Under our former system of foreign economic activity such ties were made difficult. Now that more than 9,000 Soviet enterprises, cooperatives, and other organizations are independently entering the foreign markets the situation is changing. We are currently setting up an international center for the development of small enterprises; in Italy this is handled by Confindustria and the association of chambers of trade. There are, therefore, organizing partners on both sides. It may be possible to provide certain privileges and preferences for small and medium firms on both sides. In short, we have a field of work ahead of us, and we can get down to developing it. On a broader plane, we can also put some thought into creating joint consultancy firms for studying the Soviet market on a commercial basis. This would probably provide a stimulating effect as regards linking up our market with the Italian market.

Esteemed gentlemen, the talks on drawing up a trade and cooperation agreement between the USSR and the European Communities have just ended in Brussels. If it is signed soon, we will have an innovative document in many respects, that takes relations far beyond the confines of conventional trade and lifts many restrictions. It is to be hoped that the USSR and Italy will derive the expected advantages from it. However, this is also a concrete contribution to the general European process, and a major step toward creating a general European economic space.

What do we understand by this? From our point of view it is above all a process. Taking part in it on an equal footing will be countries and integrational associations with quite substantial economic differences. No one will be forced to accept what does not suit him. However, each must of course adapt to his partners on a basis of balance of interests.

Cooperation will be developing in those spheres and in those directions that will have been jointly found to be mutually acceptable. The system of relations must be flexible and capable of rapidly changing its forms and methods, and also of changing its priorities, in accordance with the requirements of the partners. As experience is amassed, a rapprochement of the participating countries will take place, and we will be developing new tools of economic interaction which will be common to all. Ultimately, a general European process of integration will develop. In no case do we see a general European economic space as something self-contained and in opposition to other world economic zones—to say nothing of the fact that the United States of America and Canada will be taking part in it from the very beginning. We start from the premise that the shaping of a general European economy does not infringe upon the world's existing economic ties. On the contrary, it will be conducive to perfecting them and creating the genuine world market that could become the material basis of a new period of peace in human history. We envisage that the initial organizational nucleus on the path to a European economic space could be provided by the machinery of consultation between the EEC, the European Free Trade Association and CEMA.

Such a universal body as the UN Economic Commission for Europe can make an increasing contribution to this process. I would like to draw attention also to the Mediterranean aspect of the European economic process. No country connected with the Mediterranean region should suffer damage due to the economic consolidation of Europe. On the contrary, for each of them fresh opportunities and incentives for their own development will emerge. Incidentally, is it not time to think about convening a forum of economic cooperation of the Mediterranean states, including the Black Sea states?

In conclusion, I would like to touch upon two more matters. The first is ecological security. The creation of nature-conserving technologies and even of ecologically pure production systems is acutely topical, but these are not exhaustive measures. We, the people of the earth, together must concern ourselves not only with protecting nature from a further depletion of its resources, but also with her ability to restore herself.

Here problems arise which today have not yet been given due consideration. They concern a new approach by man to his wants, to the very organization of his life. The slogan Back to Nature is pretty but fruitless. It is absurd to reject progress and to ignore its achievements. A slogan of Onward to Nature, of onward to new relations between man and the environment, between the organic and nonorganc world is needed. Questions of ecology worry Italians and also worry us. Some parts of our country have become ecological disaster zones. We know that the Italian state and major Italian economic associations, including the Confindustria, busy themselves in a serious way with ecology, and develop interesting projects. We would like to arrange very close cooperation with Italy in this sphere.

The principled agreement on both sides is important. Who will carry it out in practice? We can come to an agreement on this. The second problem is the conversion of the military industry. The progress of talks on disarmament puts it on the agenda. We have already started this work at home. The state program that is tied up with the plans for economic development under conditions of perestroyka has been worked out. However, our first experience already says that there are a lot of difficulties and surprises here. Conversion is an all-embracing and very complex process.

It touches on many spheres of life. To start with, switching military production to civilian production will not be cheap, although in future the advantages will be enormous and diverse. We welcome the agreement on the creation of a Soviet-Italian working group, and on the program of joint research work. There is no doubt that the process of conversion itself and cooperation in this area will assist a general upturn in economic relations between our countries. Naturally we are in favor of a wide international exchange and international cooperation on this problem.

Finally, something without which all ideas and plans as a rule remain on paper or even in the air—the monitoring of the implementation of the agreements and accords. Now, after a whole package of major documents have been signed, this is particularly important. One would not want the Confederation of Industry, the Italo-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, and the appropriate Italian state organs, together with similiar organizations of ours, to delay in creating an efficient, flexible, and of course totally equitable mechanism capable of guaranteeing the effectiveness of our cooperation.

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, now that the cold war is over, when a new character of relations between the East and the West is being increasingly delineated, economic influence must play its indispensable role in the restructuring of international relations—an enterprising and influential role. Mars and Mercury, who have long been competing, must at last occupy the positions determined for them by the new epoch: Mars in the museum, Mercury in the arena of the formation of new relations between people, nations, states, and continents. Thank you.

Visits Milan, Meets Mayor

LD0312111589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Dec 89

["From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] We have just received another report from our special correspondents in Milan.

[Unidentified correspondent over video of enthusiastic crowds greeting Gorbachev and entourage in the streets of Milan] This is Milan, foggy and cold and businesslike. Milan's people, with their northern reserve, are frequently described as cold. That is by comparison with Rome, of course! (video shows crowds shouting, waving, chanting Gorbachev's name] This is Cathederal Square, whose glory is the splendid Gothic cathedral, the Duomo. It was the first stop for the Soviet visitor. [video shows more shots of enthusiastic crowds] And these are the cold Milanese!

To get to La Scala Square, where the residence of the mayor is to be found, you must pass through the Vittorio Emanuele covered gallery—just a few dozen meters. The strict protocol did not even allow a minute for this walk! [video shows Gorbachev, Raisa and entourage making their way through crowd, waving and smiling] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his entourage arrived at the Marino Palace, and the first welcome here was from Milanese children. [Video shows Raisa being presented with bouquet and kissing children. Dignitaries with Gorbachev and entourage inside town hall] In the council chamber, the Soviet visitor was addressed by Paolo Pillitteri, the mayor of Milan. He declared that, fulfilling the wishes of the townspeople, the municipality was officially proposing the Soviet president for the Nobel Peace Prize. This is how Comrade Gorbachev began his speech in reply. [video shows Gorbachev speaking]

[Begin Gorbachev recording] I have already told the mayor that I am confused at the disorder in Milan! I think, in the program of our visit, the visit here was stipulated for, and you should have prepared yourselves well! I express this observation to the mayor and greet the disorder I met in the streets of Milan as something tremendous. Esteemed Milanese, residents of Milan, and dear friends, I and all my comrades in the delegation and Raisa Maksimovna are stunned to the bottom of our hearts by this display friendly feelings toward the Soviet Union, the Soviet people, and those deeds that it does now. Of course, we started perestroyka because we are the ones who above all need perestroyka. But we know that our perestroyka is needed by all those who think about a better world, cooperation and the future—a bright future—for all of us. I have seen one slogan on my way to the town hall, which read: 1989 is the year of the Russian people. I understand that the Milanese wished to express their solidarity and involvement in our deeds of national renewal. Thank you to all Milanese for this solidarity.

Things are difficult now. What we are doing now, our people have never done before in its history. Today we understand better what we want and how to achieve it. We are asked about how we can be helped. We want to be understood—this is the main thing. We must perform our perestroyka ourselves—with our intellects, our hearts, and our hands. We are sure that we can measure up to it. Let me assure you that our peoples—peoples of this huge country—will do eveything to enoble their country and open up to all other peoples for cooperation and relations in order to stand firmly for the cause of peace and a happy future for all people.

In the presence of your country's head of government, Mr Andreotti, his spouse, and other members of the Italian Government, I want to inform you that we have done good work in Rome, on Italian soil, over these last few days. Good joint ventures with respect to political relations as well as economic and cultural cooperation, lie ahead of us. We are pleased with this trend in the development of our relations. The roots of the friendship between our peoples stretch far back through the centuries. Here Mr Mayor has quoted some facts on this account. But it is important that this tree of friendship grow and bear new fruit. This is our common cause, and what was done today and yesterday and during the visit

is just what promises good results for our cooperation. All Italians must know that they have reliable friends and partners in the Soviet Union. Thank you for your attention and for this wonderful meeting. I thank you, Mr Mayor, for the very meaningful words you said. We will remember this meeting in Milan. It was not for nothing that we strove to come to Milan, though there were a lot of competitors! Thank you. [end recording]

[Correspondent] The Soviet visitor was given the title of honorary citizen of Milan, and he was presented with an old seal of the Sforza dukes, who turned Milan into a flourishing city. Mikhail Sergeyevich and Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacev; Giulio Andreotti; Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze; and Gianni de Michelis signed the distinguished visitors' book. [passage omitted: scene shifts to Sforza Castle, where Gorbachev spoke to businesmen and gave joint press conference]

Addresses Milan City Council

LD0112173789 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Milan December 1 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev's first meeting in Milan today was with the city council.

Milan's mayor, Paolo Pillittieri, welcomed the Soviet president whom he described as a courageous leader, a man of disarmament and peace, a reformer who is changing the face of the USSR and Eastern Europe.

In his reply Gorbachev thanked the Mayor and all Milan residents for the cordial reception. He viewed their welcome as a demonstration of friendly feelings towards the USSR and the Soviet people.

"We have started perestroyka precisely because we need it," Gorbachev said. "But we also know that perestroyka is needed by all those who dream of a better world, of cooperation and of a brilliant future.

"Despite all hardships, the USSR itself should implement this policy," the president pointed out.

He expressed confidence that Soviet people are capable of accomplishing this task. "The peoples of the USSR will do everything to refine their country and open it up to cooperation with other nations."

Gorbachev praised the results of his negotiations and meetings in Rome, stressing that great opportunities were emerging for the two countries both in the sphere of political relations and in the field of economic and cultural cooperation.

"The roots of our friendship go deep into history," he remarked. "It is therefore very important that the tree of friendship develop and bear fruit."

Gorbachev, Andreotti News Conference

LD0112224789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1802 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Joint press conference held by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti, in Milan; Andreotti remarks in Italian with superimposed Russian translation—live]

[Text] [Unidentified Italian Foreign Ministry official—in Russian—remarks in progress]...and of his colleague Gerasimov. This news conference is being held in a rather cramped hall. If you agree, would you please read your introduction to us, and then there will be eight questions, from both sides.

[Gorbachev] Good evening, ladies and gentlemen: In these 3 days that we have spent among the Italians, you have practically seen everything. You know a lot, or nearly all. I'll say that we shall remember these 3 days, above all, in human terms. The welcome accorded to us here by everyone, from the president and prime minister to the large crowds of people in the streets—and this struck us particularly in Milan—arouses great feeling in return, and prompts serious reflection. Well, one can even now say that my visits, one after the other, and my personal observations, confirm that fundamental changes are taking place in the world.

The people are decisively invading the sphere of politics. Either approving, or rejecting, or advising, or demanding from the politicians actions adequate to the present time. As for the feelings we have encountered on Italian soil, on the part of the Italians, they have deep roots. No doubt the Italian temperament is present here. I am myself a southerner and able to appreciate temperament in people. [laughter] But that probably isn't the whole story, if we consider only that. Evidently, what I mentioned is in operation. People want change. If anyone thinks they want it only in one part of the world, he's deeply mistaken. People everywhere want changes for the better: in relations, cooperation, human contacts. Our presence here on Italian soil is one more confirmation of that very important philosophical thesis.

Second: The substantial direct political results of the visit. I should say that we single out the Soviet-Italian political dialogue for its thoroughness, for its stability, for the fact that it always preserves an atmosphere, an atmosphere that makes it possible to discuss the most difficult issues calmly.

You know how important that is in politics. That gives me reason to say that Soviet-Italian relations are an important factor, a major political quantity, in the present political dialogue which embraces both Europe and the whole world. Above all, I want to emphasize in this connection—I hope mr prime minister will agree with this—that we have been able to note that we are deeply devoted to the Helsinki process. This is a very important observation, because the time of rapid change

in which we live may often, perhaps, seem, or stimulate some people, to renounce all that has existed hitherto that has been positive. The negative is something one must always firmly renounce. So, to preserve the Helsinki process, to give it its second wind, to move on to Helsinki II, and capture in this new stage of the Helsinki process the imperatives of today, of this stormy time in which we not only don't have time to interpret the phenomena at the level of politics, but even in the press I know you have difficulty about what to write, what are we dealing with, what is happening?

I'll say something later about my conversation with the Pope, but I'll make use of one remark that he made a little earlier. Referring to his remark, I told him that I share this approach, that at a time of rapid change one should not fall into pessimism, and one must confidently seek and build new relations and a new world. From that point of view I greatly value the political dialogue and the very thorough talks we've had these days, and we've had a lot of talks, with the president of the republic, Mr Cossiga, and especially with Mr Andreotti, my old partner, as I can now call him.

This is what has enabled us to sign important documents which demonstrate a new stage in our relations. You know about them.

I would like to single out the political declaration which is attuned to what is going on in the world today. The visit has taken stock of our great activity in the sphere of the economy. The Soviet and the Italian sides were pioneers in arranging economic relations between the West and the East. Today—we held meetings just recently with the business circles—we have a good prospect of advancing in this sphere too, moving over from trade to new forms of cooperation encompassing the most diverse options in this respect.

It seems to me that we have rightly talked a lot about Europe. Today, perhaps, the European process is important to all of us because this is where answers are being sought. In what direction, how, and in what forms will both Europe itself and the whole world be developing? I have spoken before you many a time—and I see many familiar faces here—saying that Europe has the right to lay claim to doing something which would be important and interesting not only for Europe, but for the whole world. It has a history, a very instructive history, at whatever part of it and at whatever period you look. It has culture, a tradition, political and intellectual capital. This enables the Europeans to give something important in our common interests. We devoted a great deal to this. We have been reflecting what the European home is and how it should be built, what walls should be demolished and what walls should be erected.

But there was one thing on which we have agreed. At one time in the past we were reproached for trying to export revolution. But if the perestroyka of Europe is built on the basis of exporting different values to Eastern [European] countries, this will be the same thing, but only now from the opposite direction.

I think, we agreed—and this was a very important point in our discussion—that we must remain ourselves, devoted to our values, and respect each other's choice, culture, attachments, and psychological make-up, and so on. And at the same time cooperate.

As the experience of recent years shows this is possible, it is even interesting. It is a strong stimulus when one compares many variants in economics, social experiences, and in the solving of cultural problems and tasks of the political process. This only stimulates and enriches us all.

And so, there are no obstacles in our diversity. On the contrary, these are stimuli. This is the path on which we already stand, and we have spoken of this. We are going through a very important moment, a turning point to another, better world. We are turning together. It has only just begun; everything is only just being born. This is all so important and significant that any ill-thought-through action, never mind irresponsible, may strike a blow. We were agreed that we must be responsible.

A couple of words about the visit to the Vatican. A few hours ago I left His Holiness. We had a really substantive and significant conversation. We spoke of politics and morals—in the first place of values common to all mankind. Today's politics can lay claim to be, and be called, serious when it enriches itself with the experience common to all mankind and with what mankind has selected in relations between peoples—those same values common to all mankind to which we are giving priority. This was the most important theme. There was a high level of agreement between us, even a coincidence of expression and terms. I am very satisfied with the high level of this conversation, with the concern, and the large coincidence of views as regards the world and approaches to building that world.

We spoke about perestroyka. I heard from the Pope words of support and an evaluation of what our people are doing. This is really important. Such an understanding for what we are doing is important not only for us, but we expect for all as well. We spoke about religion, about the processes taking place in Europe, in the world, and in the Soviet Union in this sphere.

We spoke...I told His Holiness that we are preparing a law on freedom of conscience, in which the necessary legal preconditions will be created to satisfy these needs of our people. Many peoples and many beliefs cohabit in the Soviet Union. We intend—and are already doing so in practice—to take this into account, in order that it be an organic part of perestroyka. That's all I have to say.

[Andreotti] There are a few things I would like to add to what the president has said, because I totally agree with his account not only of the visit, but of what preceded

that visit and of the prediction about what will follow that visit, because the fact that we have concluded numerous treaties really does greatly satisfy us. But the main satisfaction will be when in 6 months time, and 6 months more, we sum up the results and see everything that has been accomplished on the basis of the agreements that were signed yesterday. Otherwise this would be merely an expression of good intentions. There is an Italian saying that the road to hell is paved with good intentions, and we must do nothing that will take us along this road. Therefore, this line—the existence of an Italian policy that has always attempted to present the assertion of its own convictions and international obligations—would always like to be an element of reconciliation. [sentence as heard] It is very easy to pick out and cultivate everything that divides us; indeed some people have a kind of special ability at this. But sometimes the opposite abilities can seem a weakness. We have always considered our task to be not to exacerbate difficult situations, but, on the contrary, to help resolve them.

We have always tried to speak with certain reservations, we've been saying that our systems are profoundly different, that our systems are in opposition to each other. Yet we try to work together. But since you, mr president, began your policy, the whole situation has changed.

I would like to say two things. In 1985, on the eve of an important meeting, of your decisive meeting with President Reagan from which came the new platform of talks, Reagan summoned us to New York as a member of the alliance, as an ally. He said this to me: I hope Gorbachev will succeed in doing this. Before history and before our own conscience, none of us must have any qualms of conscience that we didn't help him. I think that last year when in Moscow I represented the Italian economy which wants to cooperate with perestroyka, we talked in that direction. I think we should continue on that path.

And then—and this is my last preliminary remark—it is not for nothing that this evening President Gorbachev in his speeches today, yesterday, and the day before yesterday mentioned very forcefully and frequently the Helsinki Final Act. That is, disarmament, economic cooperation, human rights, and also—the president has just mentioned this—to bear in mind that all those who are working for the unification of Europe and for a great Europe do not at all want to consider this the antithesis of cooperation between the United States and Europe. On the contrary, Helsinki means that both the United States and Canada are Europeans just like the other European states of the security conference. When we speak of preparing for a second Helsinki conference, we have in mind just such principles.

I think that what has been done and said, and the text of the joint statement is a good contribution to that really exhilirating task of working to ensure, as our statement says, that confrontation is replaced by dialogue and cooperation, and enmity and suspicion by transparency.

[Unidentified questioner in Italian with phrase by phrase Russian translation] [Name indistinct] editor-in-chief of the most important Italian newspaper, and the most prestigious, CORRIERE DELLA SERA. Thank you. As editor of CORRIERE DELLA SERA, that is a journal, a newspaper, which for 100 years has been one of the symbols of Milan, I want to say welcome to our two guests, President Gorbachev, and President [as heard] Andreotti. I want to say this especially on behalf of all Milanese journalists.

Then I want to ask a question, a question for both presidents. It is a question which I prepared, and which they have already answered in part. It concerns the spirit of the Helsinki process. President Gorbachev proposed a conference, a meeting next year of all the members of the first Helsinki Treaty. I would like to ask, what should be the aims of this Helsinki II? What problems are being posed now? What is the nature of this Helsinki II? And I would like to ask the same question to the president of the Council of Ministers, Andreotti, who particularly insisted on a concept which, it seems to me, is very important, that is that the dialogue in Helsinki is not only an intra-European dialogue, between the West and East in Europe, but includes both the United States and Canada. That is, it poses the question of stability throughout the present-day world.

[Gorbachev] I would briefly say that the need to speed up and hold this meeting of the Helsinki I type and carry on to Helsinki II is dictated by the pace of changes that are taking place in Europe as well as in the world. And I think that what we must already be discussing by now is very important; one should not allow the emergence of a diversity of readings and different attitudes in the process of these changes. Already now, at this stage of robust changes, we are maintaining an active dialogue, and that allows us to preserve the stability of the situation, and it allows us to tackle major, large-scale, and innovative tasks.

But, evidently, the time has come for everybody—after proper preparation—to sit down and discuss attitudes and criteria on the basis of which we must advance the Helsinki process further. I think it is already very important to take into account that we must overcome the negative elements that were present in the European process in the past years, and think how to introduce fresh content to those existing institutions that are actually present today and are influencing the European climate, and more than that, the world climate, too. That's why one should let NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization be political rather than military organizations. Let generals meet. Let the process of transfer to new defensive doctrines take place in essence—and in essence, I think, it is with appropriate perestroyka of armed forces on both sides. Let the processes of economic organizations in East and West Europe being drawn together take place. Let other political and social institutions which serve the interests of Europeans be filled with fresh content too. Besides, we must think a bit about a new structure, new organizations, and new

mechanisms which will make the profound changes such that they not only do not weaken, but strengthen our common security.

We must think how we want this European home and Europe to look in 5 or 10 years, compare our views. This is very important, and that's why life itself has brought us to the stage when such a meeting is already knocking at our door. We are already discussing all these problems. You feel it better than others, as well as politicians, and I think the wish of the people is for perestroyka to progress (?confidently) and to strengthen people's confidence in the future. There is an interest in this Helsinki process reaching a new level.

Very briefly I would like to say that the philosophy of perestroyka contains one most important point—the recognition of what was written in the original text of the Final Act, but for a long time remained mere words, that is, the doctrine of limited sovereignty—I think that what perestroyka does is to respect the sovereignty of each state and the special features of each state in various options. In this process of transition in the various alliances—and this continues the transition to economic, economic cooperation, and on the other hand, to arranging things now so that only the alliances, the military alliances are involved in military affairs, but not individual countries. [sentence as heard] Because if individual countries began to engage in military affairs this would, of course, be dangerous, and we hope that the arms reduction talks will continue normally, and that military affairs will play that role.

[Gennadiy Gerasimov] [words indistinct] the main newspaper—it's called PRAVDA. On a reciprocal basis, therefore, I would like to give the correspondent from PRAVDA the opportunity to put the first question.

[Unidentified questioner] The visit to Italy by the Soviet president was prepared long ago, and naturally its basic results were planned earlier by both sides. I would like to put a question to both leaders. Have the actual results of it completely coincided with expectations?

[Gorbachev] If I am to be brief then I would make bold to assert that the results have surpassed our expectations.

[Unidentified speaker in Italian with phrase by phrase Russian translation] On the other side is my colleague Gennadiy Gerasimov. I will direct things on this side. The director of television's Channel Two, (Mr De la Volte); then we will listen to the director of the Vremya program as well.

[De La Volte in Italian with Russian translation] First of all, I would like to congratulate you, because our channel is following your visit, your arrival in Milan, and you have been a very welcome and very popular guest of Italian television. And we thank you for this.

Since I am a television channel director and a magazine director, I would like to put this question to you straight away. When cruise missiles were deployed in Italy, opposition to Brezhnev grew stronger in the Soviet Union, thereby aiding you, in a certain sense; and then afterward you changed everything, and this led to the beginning of the scrapping of missile bases. Is it possible now, in the new climate, to have a declaration from the Soviet side condemning the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia?

[Gorbachev] That's a difficult question. Perhaps it is always easy for us to pass judgement on the past, but if one is to remain anchored in reality and always try to approach assessments of this or that historical event—whatever traces it may have left—the most correct answer should probably include an analysis of the context of the real situation. I think that the events in Czechoslovakia and other events that you and I could recall here reflected, to some extent, the abnormality of the process that was occurring both in Europe and in the world, when the arms race was gathering momentum and attaining new levels with each passing year; When the confrontation was mounting and the ideological struggle was taking on most acute forms; when on each side, the other was made anathema.

In that situation, changes and events like those in Czechoslovakia gave rise, perhaps, to a reaction that was not commensurate, as it should have been in a normal situation in which political and foreign-political processes are occurring normally. I don't think I should now analyze all the periods and stages of the unfolding of the processes in Czechoslovakia, (?because) there was the Prague Spring, which I personally—and not only I, but the Soviet leadership as well and, I think, many people—fully accept, because it was about democratization, renewal of society, and humanization. These are things that were valid then and are no less topical now. But there were also periods in which those events became acute in nature, I would say, and not without interference from both sides.

I think that for the moment I would assume the responsibility to describe that situation only to this extent: The political methods and other methods available both to the Soviet leadership and to others were not fully used in order to take a correct attitude to the situation in Czechoslovakia. That's how I would answer for the moment.

[Gerasimov] As in Italy, we also have several television channels, and so, continuing the theme of reciprocity, I should like to give a Soviet central television representative the opportunity to ask a question. Please.

[Unidentified questioner] Well, my colleague [De la Volte] spoke before me. We were having a conversation a few days ago and we came to the conclusion that the proposals which the Italian side is making in the field of economic cooperation are fine. But my colleague said: Where are you going to get such enterprising people for them to immediately head, say, 10,000 small enterprises, if, over so many decades, any kind of enterprise was trampled upon, and if it was regarded as somewhat

shameful to be enterpri ıg in economics. I would like to ask Mikhail Sergeye..ch: will the opportunity not become ripe in time to establish jointly with Italy, say, an institute for the training of enterprising people?

[Gorbachev] In the first place, it already exists. There is the managers college in Leningrad where, in fact, Milan and Leningrad are cooperating. But, you know, I would also like to answer your question in a more wide-ranging way. Yesterday we thought that the Soviet person was indifferent to what takes place in the Supreme Soviet, in the government, and generally in the sessions of the local soviets. That is what we thought. And you will confirm that that is how things were.

[Unidentified questioner] I confirm it.

[Gorbachev] You confirm it. But today, if you take a look at our society, it is becoming politically aware at such a pace, and the processes of democratization are now stimulating political activity, and the desire of people to take part in the elaboration of and the making of decisions to such an extent, that people have appeared, new people. I think that as we change the whole economic milieu, we will thus give the green light to enterprising people. And all the same, there is talent enough among our people.

But, nevertheless, I welcome the idea that while cooperating in economics we should also cooperate and amalgamate our joint efforts to train specialists to handle the present stage of cooperation.

[Unidentified questioner] A question for Mr Andreotti as well. How do you explain Gorbachev's popularity in Italy, in particular in Milan? What is the reason for it?

[Andreotti] One could give many explanations, but there are two fundamental ones. We all sense that this policy of perestroyka is being pursued not only in the interests of the Soviet people, but in the interests of mankind, in various respects. For that reason, we all have a profound interest in seeing it succeed, which is why there is so much sympathy for perestroyka and such a desire for its success.

In addition, for decades we have been living in a nightmare, not only in the nightmare of the nuclear threat and confrontation, but with great mistrust and great mutual suspicion. We have all been afraid that the opposite side would take the initiative and that the situation would deteriorate. After so many years of those policies and frequent meetings between allies, and through the meetings between the U.S. President and the Soviet president the world is starting to breathe freely. I think that people feel that the main founder of that policy is here and would like to show their involvement and agreement.

[Unidentified speaker, in Italian with phrase by phrase Russian translation] My colleague, Paolo Buonaiuti, from the newspaper IL MESSAGGERO, from Rome.

[Buonaiuti, in Italian with phrase by phrase Russian translation] at a time when monumental developments are taking place in Europe, I would like to know what President Gorbachev thinks about the aspirations for German unification, and what does President [as heard] Andreotti think about this?

[Gorbachev] In general, I have answered this question recently, but since it has been raised i will be brief. More than once here - - and I think not accidentally—President [as heard] Andreotti and I have returned to the Helsinki process—both during the talks and now at the news conference. What is the Helsinki Final Act which was signed in 1975? It is a reckoning of the political results of World War II. The Helsinki Act took place because we were realists and were seeking paths for a better world. I think we must approach matters in this way, and it is very important for politics that we take realities into consideration. History has so ordered things that the Europe of today is what we know and what is consolidated in many legal, international legal acts, including the Helsinki Final Act. This includes the fact that there are two German states, members of the United Nations, that are implementing wide interstate links, and each people decides its fate in a sovereign manner.

In this way, europe of the present, including its borders and the presence of two German [nemetskie] states, two German [germanskie] states, let's say, are the results of a certain historical period.

What will the future destiny of these two states be? Well, this interests us all. What will happen to the world, to our civilization? What will happen to Europe, to us? Time will tell. And let history itself order things.

I think that to put this question today in such a way as to imply that reunification is a topical question of international politics, I think that this would not be right. More than this, it would only complicate the situation. And this does not at all contradict the fact that the changes which are taking place in both the FRG and the GDR are opening up great possibilities for cooperation, for exchanging ties, and for human contacts so that everthing has a normal character. And so let history order things. We should not urge on and force a process that is not fully developed.

[Gerasimov] A great many foreign correspondents have come to Italy to cover the visit from Moscow, where they are accredited. Well, I want to invite the representative of the Spanish paper EL PAIS to speak.

[Gorbachev] While you are setting the microphone up, I have some information for you. Mr Andreotti and I have just received a note saying that fog is descending onto the city. One airport is already closed. Counting the journey by road, it takes 45 minutes to reach the airport. The Italian services fear that there may be difficulties with the flight to Malta. That's right, yes?

[Unidentified speaker, in Italian with phrase by phrase Russian translation] We would not, on any account, want you to be late for your meeting with Bush.

[EL PAIS correspondent, in Russian] In your opinion, should the reforms that are now taking place in Eastern Europe influence the creation and content of the European Common Market in 1992, and if they should influence it, then in what way? That is one question.

Another question: People talk more and more often at present about Central Europe. That is not just a European concept. I would like to know how, in present conditions, you understand the concept of Central Europe.

[Gorbachev] We have discussed this subject. If we speak about building the pan-European home, we must have in mind that we must also seek ways of integration between the economic organizations, such as the CEMA and the EEC. And we have discussed this subject substantially. What is more, you know that the other day an agreement was signed on this subject between us and the European Market. Therefore, it seems to me that already now there is an understanding that a common economic dimension should be created in Europe. What is more, the reforms that are under way in Eastern European countries, including in the sphere of the economy and changes in foreign economic links, show that these countries are opening up more to the Europeans in the West.

I think that these political and economic changes create confidence that in the long run we can look realistically at creating the European economic dimension in which pan-European mechanisms will be in operation. And Central Europe, I think, is, of course, more important for you and for me in a political sense. I welcome the fact that expressions of concern and alarm are coming from Eastern Europe, especially about that which is connected with military confrontation. It seems to me that these impulses, these signals, have been perceived both in the west and in the east, and that they are reflected in the negotiating processes and in that which is related to Vienna. And I must say that they were always present whenever the talks concerning nuclear arms were at issue. I think that in this respect Central Europe must speak in its full voice.

[Unidentified speaker, in Italian with phrase by phrase Russian translation] [Words indistinct] Mr President, Linata Airport is closed. Perhaps the other airport will also be closed. We only have 50 minutes to get there, and I ask you to excuse us. You have got an idea of our desire to work together.

More on News Briefing

PM0412113789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Milan"]

[Excerpts] Milan, 2 Dec—As already reported, at the end of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Italy the Soviet leader and G. Andreotti held a joint press conference. [passage omitted]

G. Andreotti Introductory Speech

I shall add a few thoughts to what the president said. I share his assessment not only of this visit but, also of the whole period preceding it and also his predictions. I shall say straight away that the concrete and detailed side of things and the numerous documents that we signed give us cause for great satisfaction. However, we cannot feel a sense of real satisfaction until six months or a year from now when we sum up the results and see what in those agreements we have managed to implement. Otherwise these documents will remain mere statements of good intentions. There is an old proverb that "The road to hell is paved with good intentions." In the present situation we simply cannot let that happen.

Italy in its policy has always sought to play a peacemaking role while preserving the firmness of its convictions and adhering to its international commitments. It is very easy to exaggerate differences. By all accounts, many people have an aptitude for that. Sometimes the opposite approach can seem like weakness. We for our part have always considered that our duty is not to aggravate a situation but to try to help find solutions. For a long time we had to be cautious, saying: Our systems are profoundly different from one another, our positions are diametrically opposed, and despite that we are trying to work together. Since you began implementing your policy, Mr President, the situation has changed.

I should like to add two things. In 1985, on the eve of your important and, I would say, crucial meeting with Reagan at which a platform for talks was to be elaborated, Reagan telephoned us as bloc allies and said: "I wish Gorbachev success. In any event none of us should face history with the thought on his conscience that he didn't help him." I believe that our foreign policy stand and last year's appearance at an exhibition in Moscow by Italian industry, which wants to help perestroyka, aided progress in this direction. I believe that we should proceed further in this direction.

One final point. It is no coincidence that President Gorbachev in his speech here today and his speeches yesterday and the day before persistently recalled the Helsinki Final Act. This document envisages activity in favor of disarmament, economic cooperation, and human rights. As the president just recalled, it also takes into account the fact that helping to achieve European unity is not seen as opposing cooperation between Europe and the United States. On the contrary, what Helsinki means is that within the CSCE framework the United States and Canada are as European as all the countries of Europe. When we talk about the need to prepare a Helsinki II, we are proceeding from that very political assessment. It seems to me that in everything that we have done—and the text of the joint declaration bears this out—we made a considerable contribution to the fulfillment of this exciting task: Acting to replace confrontation with dialogue, hostility with cooperation, suspicion with openness. [Andreotti speech ends]

Question from CORRIERE DELLA SERA: This question is addressed to both participants in the press conference and relates to the Helsinki process. President Gorbachev has proposed that a meeting of all the participants in the first Helsinki conference be held next year. What should the aims and nature of this new Helsinki II be? What problems are on the agenda now? I would also like an answer to that from Signor Andreotti, who noted in particular that the Helsinki dialogue is not exclusively intra-European but includes the United States and Canada—in other words, it affects the stability of the whole world.

Gorbachev: Briefly I would say that the need to bring this meeting forward and achieve a Helsinki II is dictated by the pace of the changes occurring both in Europe and the world. Now, too, I believe that the things we should discuss are very important. Variant readings and different approaches cannot be allowed during these tumultuous changes. We are already maintaining an active dialogue. This provides an opportunity to preserve the stability of the situation and enables major, large-scale, and innovative tasks to be resolved. But clearly the time has come when after due preparation we should sit down together and discuss the approaches and criteria whereby we must further develop the Helsinki process.

It is very important to bear in mind now, I think, that we must overcome the negative elements present in the European process in previous years, and must consider how to impart new content to the institutions which are actually in existence now and are influencing the European climate and indeed the whole world climate. Therefore, let NATO and the Warsaw Pact be more political organizations than military. Let the generals meet. Let there be a real shift to new defensive doctrines, in other words essentially a restructuring of the corresponding armed forces on both sides. Let there be processes of rapprochement between the economic organizations of East and West Europe. Let the other political and social institutions which serve Europeans' interests be filled with new content. In addition, we must think about a new structure, new organizations, new mechanisms which will make deep changes which would not only not weaken our common security but would strengthen it. We should think about how we want our European home and all of Europe to be in 5-10 years and compare views. This is very important.

Life itself has brought us to the point where such a meeting is knocking at our door. After all, we are already discussing all these problems. I think that you, like the politicians, sense the peoples' desire that perestroyka should work, that people's confidence in the future should strengthen, and that the Helsinki process should reach a new level.

Andreotti: Very briefly I should like to note that the perestroyka concept includes a very important provision—the recognition of a provision which was in the text of the Final Act but which for a long time has remained on paper only. This is the full renunciation of the doctrine of "limited sovereignty." It seems to me that the perestroyka policy recognizes each state's right to its own identity and allows each state to develop freely, allowing different forms and diversity.

Furthermore, it is necessary to ensure that the blocs, while continuing to study their own problems, also devote attention to the environment and economic cooperation. At the same time it is now necessary to ensure that military problems are studied by alliances and not individual countries. Otherwise in such a tumultuous period as ours this may be fraught with dangers. Let us hope that the arms reduction talks will make rapid progress and that the military aspect ceases to dominate. But at the moment the blocs must perform their military functions.

Question from PRAVDA: The Soviet president's visit to Italy was prepared long ago and, of course, its main results were planned in advance by the two sides. I would like to ask: Did its actual results entirely match the anticipated ones?

Gorbachev: Briefly, I would venture to state that the results exceeded our expectations.

Question from Italian television: Can we expect the Soviet Union to make a statement condemning the military intervention in Czechoslovakia?

Gorbachev: That is not an easy question. Perhaps it sometimes seems to us that it is easy to judge the past, but if one is to be realistic and tries to approach a full evaluation of this or that historical event, whatever impact it may have had, the most correct answer clearly must include an analysis of the real context, the real situation. I think that the events in Czechoslovakia and other events which we could mention here reflected to some extent the abnormality of the process taking place in Europe and the world at that time. The arms race, gathering momentum, was reaching new heights each year, confrontation was increasing, and the ideological struggle was assuming the most acute forms when each side anathematized the other.

In that situation changes and events like those in Czechoslovakia did not generate the appropriate reaction that they would have had in a normal atmosphere when the political and foreign policy processes are taking their normal course. I don't think I ought to analyze now all the stages of the development of the processes in Czechoslovakia, because there is the "Prague Spring" which I personally—and not only I but all the Soviet leadership and many people—fully accept, because the issue then was about democratization, the renewal of society, and its humanization. That was right then and it is no less relevant now.

However, there was also a period when those events acquired, I would say, an acute nature that was not without interference from one side or the other. I would

now assume the responsibility to say that in that situation the Soviet leadership did not make full use of all the political methods at its disposal to respond correctly to the Czechoslovak situation. That is the answer I would give now.

Question from Soviet television: I would like to ask, Mikhail Sergeyevich, will there not eventually be an opportunity to create together with Italy an institution for the training of business-minded people?

Gorbachev: In the first place, there already is one. There is a management school in Leningrad. This is the very sphere where Milan and Leningrad are already cooperating. But you know, I would like to give a broader answer to your question. In the past we believed that the Soviet man was indifferent to what was happening in the Supreme Soviet, the government, and local soviet sessions in general. And you will confirm that this was the case. But look at our society now. It is becoming politicized at such a rate, and these democratization processes are now stimulating political activeness so much, that people's desire to take part in the preparation and making of decisions is increasing sharply. People, new people have emerged. I think that as we change the entire economic environment we will thereby open the way to people with initiative. And after all, our people do not lack talent. Nevertheless, I welcome the idea that while cooperating in the economy we should pool our efforts in training the cadres to tackle the present stage of cooperation.

Question from Soviet television: Mr Andreotti, how do you explain M.S. Gorbachev's popularity in Italy?

Andreotti: I think there are many explanations for this. But there are two main reasons. First, we all feel that his policy of perestroyka not only meets the Soviet people's interests, but also promotes the creation of new relations on a global scale. Consequently, we are all extremely interested in seeing this policy culminate in success. The enthusiasm and support that are expressed reflect the wish for such success.

Second, we lived in fear for decades, not only in fear of the nuclear threat, but also simply in conditions of great mutual suspicion and mistrust. Basically both sides were afraid that the other wide would take the initiative and create an explosive situation. For some years now we have seen that as a result of his policy and the frequent meetings between representatives of the blocs, including personal contacts between the presidents of the United States and the Soviet Union, the world is beginning to breathe more easily. Today we can all heave a sigh of relief. Evidently, people realized that one of the authors of this policy was visiting them, and wanted to express their support.

Question from IL MESSAGERO: I would like to know what President Gorbachev thinks at this moment, when colossal changes are taking place in Europe, about the desire for the reunification of Germany.

Gorbachev: I have already answered this question recently, but since it has arisen, I will answer in brief. I believe it is no coincidence that Mr Andreotti and I, both in the course of the talks and here at the press conference, have come back to the Helsinki process repeatedly. What is the Helsinki Final Act that was signed in 1975? It is a summing up of the political results of World War II. The Helsinki Act came about because we were realists and sought ways to reach a better world. I think that in politics it is very important for us to reckon with reality.

History has determined that Europe today takes the form that we know, which is enshrined in many international legal acts, among them the Helsinki Final Act, and that includes the fact that there are two German states that are members of the United Nations. They exercise wide interstate relations and the people of each of them have sovereignty over their destiny. Thus present-day Europe, including its borders, and also including the existence of two German states, is the outcome of a certain historical period. What will happen next with regard to the destiny of those states is of interest to all of us, as is what will happen to the world, to our civilization, to Europe, to us. I believe time will tell. Let history itself decide. To raise the question of reunification as a topical question of international politics today would be incorrect. In fact, it would only complicate the situation. However, that does not in any way contradict the fact that the changes that are taking place in the FRG and the GDR open up great opportunities for cooperation between them, for the development of ties, and for human contacts, so that all this is normal. So, let history decide. Processes that are not yet ripe should not be urged on or forced.

Mr Andreotti and I have received a report that fog is descending on the city and one airport is already closed. The Italian services are afraid that there could be difficulties with taking off for Malta. Is that so?

Andreotti: It is indeed, Mr President. And the last thing we want is to hold up your meeting with G. Bush.

Question from EL PAIS: Mr Gorbachev, how, in your opinion, should the transformations now taking place in Eastern Europe affect the formation of the all-European market in 1992? And another question. There is more and more talk about Central Europe now. I would like to know, how do you understand the term "Central Europe" in present-day conditions?

Gorbachev: We have discussed this subject. If we are talking about building a common European home, it must be borne in mind that we should also seek means of integration between economic formations like CEMA and the all-European market. And we have discussed this subject in detail. Furthermore, the other day, as you know, an agreement was signed between us and the EEC in this connection. Therefore, it seems to me that there is now an understanding of the desirability of creating a common economic space in Europe, especially since the reforms that are in progress in the Eastern European countries, including reforms in the economic sphere, and

the change in their foreign economic ties indicate that those countries are becoming more open to cooperation with the West. These changes of a political and economic nature create the confidence that ultimately we can look realistically at the prospect of creating a European economic space in which all-European mechanisms will operate.

I think that Central Europe, for all of us, is most important today in political terms, of course. I welcome the fact that signals of concern and anxiety are coming out of Central Europe, especially in connection with military confrontation. It seems to me that these warning signals are being received in both West and East and are reflected in the talks processes, in particular as far as Vienna is concerned. I should say that these signals have always been present when it was a question of talks relating to nuclear weapons. I think that in this sense Central Europe should continue to speak out.

Andreotti: Unfortunately, Malpensa Airport could close at any moment. It will take us 45 minutes to get there. I think you have already learned a lot, at least you have gained an impression of the essence of our meetings and their atmosphere, and our determination to work together. Thank you.

Gorbachev: Thank you. Goodbye.

Gorbachev Speaks to Press

LD0112201389 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Milan December 1 TASS—Addressing a news conference here today, President Mikhail Gorbachev highly assessed the political dialogue and talks with Italian President Francesco Cossiga and Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti.

The Soviet president stressed the substance and stability of the Soviet-Italian political dialogue. This dialogue is always held in an atmosphere that contributes to a calm discussion of the most difficult issues, he added.

Gorbachev described Soviet-Italian relations as an important factor, as a major political value in the current political dialogue involving Europe and the world at large.

Singling out the Soviet-Italian declaration, he said that "important documents signed during the visit demonstrate a new stage in relations between the two countries."

In the economic sphere, Gorbachev observed, both sides have a good prospect of moving ahead, turning from trade to new forms of diverse cooperation.

Gorbachev stressed the Soviet Union's commitment to the Helsinki process that should be maintained and invigorated to proceed towards Helsinki-2.

"It is necessary to confidently look for and build new relations and a new world," he said.

Gorbachev emphasised that Europe has history, a very instructive history, and it has culture, tradition, political capital and intellectual capital to enable the Europeans to achieve very important accomplishments in the common interest.

In the talks with the Italian leadership, he said, both sides agreed that there should be no export of revolution to Western Europe and no export of western values to the east.

It was agreed that the two sides should remain committed to their values and respect each other's choice, culture, allegiance and mentality.

Gorbachev described as "substantive and meaningful" the meeting with Pope John Paul II in the Vatican today.

He said that universal human values and issues of politics and morality were the main topics of the conversation.

The Soviet president expressed satisfaction with the high level of the conversation and the identity of views demonstrated by the interlocutors.

Present-day politics can be called serious only when it is enriched with universal human experience, Gorbachev remarked.

Perestroyka was also discussed. The pontiff expressed support for changes carried out by the Soviet people, Gorbachev said.

The Soviet leader and the head of the Roman Catholic Church discussed religious processes in europe and throughout the world.

Gorbachev informed the pope about the drafting of a law on freedom of conscience in the USSR, that would envisage legal conditions for the exercise of spiritual needs of the Soviet people.

Stressing that the Soviet Union is a community of many ethnic groups and religious faiths, Gorbachev expressed the firm intention to take into account these issues so that they could become an organic party of perestroyka.

"A vigorous dialogue making it possible to preserve a stable situation and resolve large-scale tasks is in progress in Europe," Gorbachev said.

Asked about the purposes of a new meeting of leaders of European countries, the United States and Canada, he proposed to be held in 1990, Gorbachev said that it is necessitated by the pace of changes taking place in Europe and the world.

"The time has come to get down to a negotiating table again and to discuss the approaches to the development of the Helsinki process and to fill it with new contents," he said.

Gorbachev believes that one of the steps in this direction could be imparting to NATO and Warsaw Treaty Organisation a political nature, rather than military, with a simultaneous change of the miltary doctrines and the restructuring of the armed forces of both sides.

"New structures, organisations and mechanisms that would strengthen universal security could be considered at such a meeting," Gorbachev said.

Assessing the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia, the Soviet president said that they reflected the abnormality of the process that was then taking place in Europe and the world.

He recalled that at that period the arms race was gaining momentum and reaching new levels every year, that the confrontation was mounting and ideological struggle assuming acute forms.

"In that situation, changes and events like those in Czechoslovakia induced inadequate reaction," Gorbachev said.

He noted that the political and other methods the sides, including the Soviet leaders, had not used to the utmost for ensuring a correct attitude to the Czechoslovak situation. [sentence as received]

Asked about the possibility of German states, United Nations members, is an indisputable fact," Gorbachev said. "The contemporary European frontiers, the existence of the two German states are the outcome of a definite historic period," he said.

Gorbachev noted that the further destiny of the civilisation, of all people, of Europe, of the two German states will be determined by history.

The Soviet president said it would be unjustifiable artificially to emphasise the question of German's reunification. This would only complicate the situation.

At the same time, the changes taking place in the German Democratic Republic and in West Germany open great opportunities for the widening of cooperation and exchanges between the two countries, Gorbachev said.

ANSA on Press Conference

AU0212163789 Rome ANSA in English 1018 GMT 2 Dec 89

["Joint Press Conference"—ANSA headline]

[Text] (ANSA) Milan, Dec 2—Pope John Paul II and Soviet head of state Mikhail Gorbachev, who ended their historic encounter in the Vatican Friday [1 December] with an announcement of the decision to establish diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the Soviet Union, had what the Kremlin leader said was "a conversation rich in content and significance."

Gorbachev said: "During the meeting, we often used the same terms. The same expressions, as regards the problems to be faced in the world.

"I explained the objectives of perestroyka and the Pope expressed to me his support for what the Russian people are doing," added the Soviet president in a brief statement to journalists before the opening of a joint press conference with Italian Premier Giulio Andreotti.

During the press conference which marked the end of Gorbachev's three-day visit to Italy, he also reiterated the view that German reunification is not now an issue for international policy consideration and returned to his call for an updated "Helsinki two" conference.

Responding to journalists' questions, Gorbachev said that at present, discussions of German reunification would only complicate the general situation and affirmed that time and history would decide the matter in the future. History must not be pushed or forced but this does not detract from recent developments in East Germany which point the way towards greater cooperation and trade with West Germany, he said.

Insisting on maintaining the status quo, he said the two German states were both members of the United Nations, arose as a consequence of World War II and are in keeping with the Helsinki Final Act, signed by 35 European nations and the United States and Canada.

In this connection, Gorbachev returned to a point he made in a speech delivered Thursday [30 November] in the Rome Campidoglio, City Hall, in which he called for holding a conference of the Helsinki signatory nations as early as next year for work on a 'commonwealth of sovereign democratic states' to supersede the blocs East and West.

After referring to the speed of changes now underway in Europe, the Soviet President said a conference of the 35 plus [as received] and the U.S. and Canada would be necessary now to focus on ways and means for overcoming past negative aspects and providing new content to the Helsinki agreements.

Asked about the deployment of Warsaw Pact tanks and troops in Czechoslovakia in July 1968 to crush the "Prague spring" liberalization movement, Gorbachev said: "political means were not adequately used, either by Soviet authorities or by others, to give the right approach to the Czechoslovak situation." He also said that the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 came in the context of a "non-normal" climate of bitter confrontation between the East and West.

The Italian head of government, taking the rostrum, referred to the "great satisfaction" with what he said was "the concrete part" of the Soviet leader's visit, with reference to the agreements signed by the two sides. But the real satisfaction, he added, "will come in six months when we check to see what has been achieved."

Andreotti went on to speak of Italian policy as, "a factor for pacification. It is very easy to take and cultivate all that which is divisive."

After noting that Italy has always sought to avoid aggravating situations and to facilitate agreement, the premier quoted a line said in 1985, in New York, by former American President Ronald Reagan: "I hope that Gorbachev succeeds and, anyway, none of us must be found by history or by ourselves to have remorse for not having helped him."

"Our efforts have been in this direction and it is in this direction that we must continue," said Andreotti.

Fifty minutes into the press conference, held in Milan's Sforzesco Castle, the decision was reached to bring it to an end because of fog moving into the area and the Soviet leader's flight to Malta to begin his summit Saturday with American President George Bush.

As Andreotti quipped, "We do not want to take on the responsibility for putting off his meeting with Bush," Gorbachev concluded by remarking that the outcome of his talks in Italy with the premier, President Francesco Cossiga and other government authorities had been "greater than expected, on all levels."

Gorbachev Meets Italian Party Leaders

LD0112190789 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Rome December 1 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev met the heads of all the parties in the Italian governing coalition during his state visit to Italy.

The president expressed profound satisfaction with the atmosphere and character of his meetings with the Italian leadership and with the political results of negotiations here.

He praised the atmosphere of the talks which were characterised by openness, substance and the strengthening sense of mutual trust.

Gorbachev said that the talks dwelt not only on bilateral relations to which both countries want to impart fresh dynamism and a new dimension, but also on international problems, both European and worldwide.

The sides discussed regional conflicts, above all in the Middle East, looked for common approaches and revealed close or similar viewpoints.

The Italian participants in the meeting with Gorbachev—Political Secretary of the Christian Democratic Party Arnaldo Forlani, Political Secretary of the Socialist Party Bettino Craxi, Secretary of the Republican Party Giorgio la Malfa, Political Secretary of the Social Democratic Party Antonio Gariglia and Political Secretary of the Liberal Party Renato Altissimo—expressed profound satisfaction with the results of the Soviet- Italian top-level negotiations.

The Italian politicians supported the Helsinki process and expressed hope that no unilateral or egoistic actions would undermine it.

The outstanding problems in Europe and the world at large can be resolved only on the basis of detente and cooperation, Forlani remarked.

Craxi stressed the significance of committed, mutually beneficial cooperation and Italy's desire to be a good partner.

Gorbachev observed that there exists a good ground for interaction with Italian parties in the name of developing Soviet- Italian relations and in the name of peace in Europe and in the world as a whole.

More on Talks With Party Heads

PM0212231589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Meetings in Italy"]

[Text] During his visit M.S. Gorbachev met with leaders of all the Italian Government coalition parties. The five conversations, each one distinctive and reflecting the partners' characteristics and interests, were important evidence of the rich potential for the development of Soviet-Italian relations.

The leaders of Italy's political forces were interested primarily in the Soviet visitor's impressions. M.S. Gorbachev expressed profound satisfaction with the atmosphere and character of his meetings with the friendly country's leaders and the political results of the talks. In first place, the Soviet leader said, I would put the atmosphere of the talks—their openness, specific nature, and the growing sense of mutual trust. I was deeply touched by Italy's attitude to us and the Italians' attitude to our people. That will remain in my memory not just as a vivid impression, but also as evidence of the depth of the ties between our peoples.

With the Italian leadership we were occupied not only with bilateral relations, to which both sides want to give new dynamism and new depth. We also discussed international problems—European and world problems. As for regional conflicts, first and foremost the Near East, we found common approaches and discovered that our views were close or similar.

As a result we saw for ourselves once again that Soviet-Italian relations have an independent influence on world politics.

The Italian interlocutors—A. Forlani, political secretary of the Christian Democratic Party; B. Craxi, political secretary of the Socialist Party; G. la Malfa, political secretary of the Republican Party; A. Cariglia, political secretary of the Social Democratic Party; and R. Altissimo, leader of the Liberal Party—expressed deep satisfaction with the results of the Soviet-Italian summit meetings.

The important point is that, despite differences in the coalition parties' political orientations, all the leaders of those parties spoke categorically in support of perestroyka and wished it success. It was noted that the success of perestroyka is the guarantee of the progress of the cause of peace and democracy throughout the world.

All of M.S. Gorbachev's interlocutors expressed support for the Helsinki all-European process and voiced the hope that no unilateral or egoistic actions will undermine it. The problems existing in Europe and the world can be resolved only on the path of detente and cooperation, A. Forlani noted. B. Craxi spoke about the significance of honest, mutually beneficial cooperation and Italy's wish to be a good partner in the common European home. Each of the interlocutors expressed the common ideas in his own words.

We have a good basis for cooperation with Italy's political parties, M.S. Gorbachev said, for the development of our relations and peace in Europe and throughout the world. So let us all work together to take advantage of these new and growing opportunities.

E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, V.V. Zagladin, and N.M. Lunkov took part in the conversations with the leaders of the ruling coalition parties.

Gorbachev, Coalition Secretaries Confer

PM0112150589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Conversations In Rome"]

[Text] Rome, 30 Nov—At noon today, M.S. Gorbachev met with L. Iotti, president of the Italian parliament's Chamber of Deputies. There was also a meeting with Senate President G. Spadolini.

Then M.S. Gorbachev had conversations with the leaders of the five government coalition parties: B. Craxi, political secretary of the Italian Socialist Party; A. Forlani, political secretary of the Christian Democratic Party; G. La Malfa, political secretary of the Republican Party; A. Cariglia, political secretary of the Social Democratic Party, and R. Altissimo, political secretary of the Liberal Party. E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, and N.M. Lunkov participated in the conversations.

Gorbachev Remarks at Award Ceremony

PM0212200189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Italy"]

[Excerpts] Rome, 1 Dec—M.S. Gorbachev's state visit to Italy ends today. [Passage omitted]

Before the official departure ceremony M.S. Gorbachev was presented with the Golden Dove of Peace at his official residence. This award is made annually by a pacifist organization, the Italian Center for Disarmament Documentation, and the National League of Cooperatives to the politician who has made the outstanding contribution to the cause of peace and disarmament.

Presenting the award, Luigi Anderlini, the center's president, stressed that he was doing this on behalf of all the Italian people. [passage omitted]

What is happening in the Soviet Union now, M.S. Gorbachev said in his reply speech, is very important not only for Soviet people themselves but for other peoples, too. We very much want to see through to the end the tremendous work that we have begun. It is still a long way to complete success, but I am convinced that all that we have planned will happen—both from the viewpoint of the internal transformations of society and the achievement of goals in the framework of the new thinking. Our people are committed to perestroyka—and that is the main thing. They are sure that the world will change for the better because the new thinking has found a broad response on all continents.

In accepting this award I should like to express my gratitude for the honor accorded me. For my own part, you may be sure that I have already made my choice. I shall take the road that I have chosen together with my comrades and my people. [Passage omitted]

Soviet, Foreign Press on Visit

LD0312124689 Moscow TASS in English 1208 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS—The Soviet press carries numerous foreign comments on President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy and the Vatican and his meeting with Pope John Paul the Second.

Prominent state and public figures and news organisations of foreign countries regard the events as yet another illustration of the positive changes on the European continent and the strengthening of contacts between various countries as a result of the Soviet Union's policy activities, the Soviet press notes.

Newspapers single out a statement issued by U.S. lawmakers—Senator Dennis Deconcini and Congressman Steny Hoyer who head the U.S. Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Welcoming Gorbachev's initiative proposed in Rome to convene a Helsinki-2 summit conference, the lawmakers emphasise that the documents signed in Helsinki are both a reliable basis and an appropriate forum to discuss East-West differences and constructive proposals aimed at ending the cold war and removing the threat to peace.

The Lawmakers urged President George Bush to consider President Gorbachev's proposal in earnest and to give a prompt and positive reply.

The press quotes a commentary by the French LE MONDE newspaper which pointed out in particular that

from now on bilateral Soviet-Italian relations will have a special character, primarily in the economic sphere.

LE MONDE pointed to the Italian business community's interest in cooperation with the Soviet Union. This interest is partially due to the fact that the Italian state grants huge credits to finance projects that will be implemented in the USSR.

The Spanish EL PAIS newspaper is quoted as saying that the Soviet president's speech to the Rome municipal council is a succinct programme for perestroika and for the relationship between socialism and humanism.

The joint Soviet-Italian declaration is such a harmonious document that, it seems, it was signed by two allied countries, and not by states that belong to differenc blocs, EL PAIS wrote.

The Soviet-Italian statement on cooperation in defence industry conversion—the first document of its kind in international relations—is the direct result of Moscow's policy of disarmament, EL PAIS observed.

The Vatican's official point of view on the Soviet president's meeting with the pope is that it was exceptionally useful, Joaquin Navarro, director of the Information Department of the Holy See, told PRAVDA.

The first and most obvious result is the very fact that Mikhail Gorbachev visited the Vatican and met the pontiff, Navarro said.

The second result is the scope of the accord which manifested itself during their meeting. This applies not only to the common concern over the problems encountered by mankind but also to the priorities the Soviet president and the pontiff, give to man as the measure of all things, as the principal value of both the church and petestroyka, Navarro said.

And finally, the third result we see in the fact that the Soviet president and the pontiff agreed in principle to give an official character to Soviet-Vatican relations, he added.

TASS Roundup of Visit

LD0112225189 Moscow TASS in English 2228 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Rome December 1 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

The official visit of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to Italy concluded on Friday. The farewell ceremony was held on Friday morning in Palazzo Quirinale. Italian President Francesco Cossiga bid goodbye to the Soviet leader. The national anthems of the two countries were played.

The ceremony was attended by Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti and other Italian officials.

In his residence before the ceremony, Mikhail Gorbachev was presented with the Gold Dove of Peace prize. The prize is annually conferred by the Italian pacifist centre for disarmament documentation and the national league of cooperatives on prominent politicians for the contribution to the cause of peace and disarmament. The prize was presented by the president of the centre, Luigi Anderlini.

From the Quirinal Palace, the convoy of limousines sped towards the Vatican in the heart of the capital. The Soviet Union has no diplomatic relations with the Holy See but contacts are maintained between the two states.

The present meeting here is viewed as yet another illustration of positive changes in Europe and strengthening ties between states resulting from new political thinking and the Soviet Union's constructive foreign policy.

In the Vatican, Mikhail Gorbachev had a talk with Pope John Paul II of the Roman Catholic church. The confidential conversation was a one-on-one affair, without interpreters, as the pope speaks Russian.

After the conversation, Pope John Paul II and Mikhail Gorbachev exchanged speeches. The pontiff gave Gorbachev and his wife souvenir medals and escorted the Soviet leader and his wife, who was also given a chance to talk with the pope, to their limousine.

After the visit to the Vatican City, the Soviet leader left Rome for Milan in company with Giulio Andreotti and Gianni de Michelis.

Welcoming the Soviet president to Milan, Mayor Paolo Pollitteri described his guest as a courageous leader, champion of peace and disarmament and an innovator who changed the look of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Pollitteri stressed that all residents of Milan wanted to express their respect, gratitude and sympathy to the Soviet leader. Milan was undoubtedly more than Italy's financial and economic capital, it was also a political and spiritual centre the mayor said.

Many people would like to use the historic opportunity afforded by Gorbachev's visit to Italy to establish direct dialogue and relations with the Soviet Union.

In turn, Mikhail Gorbachev noted, that the Soviet delegation was deeply moved by the display of friendly feelings towards the Soviet Union, the Soviet people and its present affairs.

Gorbachev stressed that not only Soviet people needed perestroyka reforms, but all those who are thinking about a better world, cooperation and a fine future for all people.

The Soviet leader met representatives of the country's business and financial community in Milan. Their

meeting was followed by a news conference at which the Soviet leader appeared jointly with Giulio Andreotti.

Gorbachev left Milan for Malta and his unofficial shipboard meeting with U.S. President George Bush on December 2nd and 3rd.

Paper Assesses Visit, Cites De Michelis

PM0112201189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Special Correspondent Yu. Subbotin dispatch: "Barrier of Distrust Crumbling"]

[Excerpts] Rome—The Soviet leader's visit to Italy is over. Hospitable, bustling Rome, where the sidewalks have been turned into car parks and pedestrians, ignoring the traffic lights, cross the street in whichever direction they like, is a thing of the past now. However, the well-known expansiveness of the inhabitants of the Italian capital in no way conflicts with their heightened sense of their own dignity. They do not usually pay special attention to foreign visitors, whatever their rank. This time, however, the Romans made an exception and, furthermore, such a striking one that in their attempts to get closer to M.S. Gorbachev they caused real concern to the security officials.

Also behind us now is "northern" Milan, which received the Soviet leader with equal warmth. [passage omitted]

Commenting on the Soviet-Italian joint declaration, Western news agency correspondents have been highlighting above all the comment that the barrier of distrust between East and West is crumbling and that Europe is on the threshold of a new era in its history. Although once again you have to criticize your colleagues for their continued conservative thinking. In the spirit of the "good" old days they are trying to attribute all this to the socialist countries alone, which are "turning over a new leaf" and beginning to "win the trust" of the West. In so doing they ignore the no less intensive counterprocess of doing away with the stereotypes of the past, a process of realization by the Western countries of the need to assert new principles of interstate relations.

There was an echo of that past, too, in one of the questions put to Italian Foreign Minister G. de Michelis at a press conference. It wasn't even a question but rather a statement very much in the manner of a rebuke.

"So you praise the joint declaration," said a voice from the hall, "which, among other things, was produced by representatives of different military-political organizations but which looks as though it was signed by allies."

"We are not allies in the old and, if I may put it this way, classical sense of the word," G. de Michelis replied. "But we are unanimous in the view that we must embrace the new political thinking and build the new Europe together."

Speaking about the significance of the Soviet-Italian declaration, he stressed in particular the importance of the principle enshrined in it of a European unity based on pluralism.

"The existing military blocs," the minister continued, "must be transformed from offensive ones into mainly defensive ones. Respect for the rights of states and the rights of the individual is the basis of true international security."

These words have something in common with the idea of a European realm of law expressed in M.S. Gorbachev's speech at Rome city hall. In the Europe of the future and, indeed, throughout the world international law must triumph based not on a balance of forces but a balance of interests, respected by all and observed without coercion.

Today we are witnesses to substantial improvements in the direction of forming a new world community. There can be no other assessment of such decisions by the USSR and Italy and the countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO as the intention to develop contacts between their armed forces on a long-term basis or the agreement on cooperation in the matter of conversion—the transfer of military enterprises to the production of civilian output.

In conversation with foreign journalists the Italian Foreign Minister also noted a number of other accords reached during the visit: the accord on regular meetings, at least twice a year, with his Soviet counterpart and the accord on consultations on regional conflicts, particularly with regard to the Near East for which, in the opinion of the USSR and Italy, direct dialogue between the PLO and Israel is necessary for a settlement to be reached.

For the time being we can sum up only the initial results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Italy and of the European year in Soviet foreign policy. But even now the outlines of the future Europe are taking shape, a Europe whose foundations are being laid today.

Andreotti Pleased With Talks, Accords

LD0212223489 Moscow TASS in English 1824 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Milan December 2 TASS—Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti expressed his satisfaction with the detailed Soviet-Italian negotiations and bilateral agreements signed during the talks at a news conference here on Friday after Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev ended his Italian visit.

Speaking about the Helsinki Final Act, Andreotti noted that the document does not position the promotion of European unity in oposition to cooperation between the United States and Europe.

On the contrary, the Helsinki act means that within the framework of the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United States and Canada are also viewed as European nations, he stressed.

Andreotti said he hopes for rapid progress in the negotiations on arms reduction, but noted, at the same time, that for now NATO and the Warsaw Treaty must perform their military functions.

Answering correspondents' questions, Andreotti said that Soviet perestroyka not only corresponds to the interests of the Soviet people, but also promotes the creation of new relations on a global scale.

The prime minister voiced desire for perestroyka's success.

He also praised Soviet foreign policy, including personal contacts between the U.S. and Soviet presidents, which enabled the world breathe a sigh of relief.

Andreotti Accepts Invitation to Visit

LD0212171189 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Rome December 2 TASS—Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti has accepted Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's invitation to come to the Soviet Union on an official visit, the information news agency ANSA reports today, referring to the Prime Minister Office.

The date of the upcoming visit will be set through diplomatic channels.

Vatican Officials Comment

LD0112184189 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Rome December 1 TASS—Vatican Press Service head Joaquin Navarro Vals told TASS that President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the Vatican and his meeting with Pope John Paul II were of great importance.

Firstly, this is the first recognition by His Holiness of the interesting changes in the USSR as well as of the sculptor of these changes, he said.

Secondly, the visit shows His Holiness' inclination to participate in common efforts and concerns for the good of people, in which the Soviet leadership participates.

It is the first visit of a Soviet leader to the Vatican. However, the visit's consequences are much more important. They will serve the cause of peace and strengthening of relations between the Vatican and the USSR, Vals stressed.

Another Vatican official, Cioacchino Busardo di Martino, expressed satisfaction with Gorbachev's visit to the Vatican. The Church wants peace. All people want peace and hope that it will be stronger now, he noted.

Italian Rescue Workers Awarded

LD0112215389 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Text] Rome November 30 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

Soviet orders "for personal courage" were presented here today to a group of Italians for their part in rescue operations following the Armenian earthquake in December last year.

Presenting the awards, Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Stefan Sitaryan said that Armenians and all Soviet people would like to express their appreciation to the Italians who responded to the calamity and helped Armenia back to its feet.

Raisa Gorbecheva Visits Sicily

LD0112145389 Moscow TASS in English 1354 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Messina December 1 TASS—The visit to the Sicilian city of Messina on Thursday by Mikhail Gorbachev's wife Raisa turned into a memorable demonstration of Soviet-Italian friendship.

Raisa Gorbachev was accompanied by People's Deputy Konstantin Frolov, author Larisa Vasiliyeva, actor Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Metropolitan Yuvenaliy, composer Andrey Petrov and other members of the Soviet public. Livia Andreotti, wife of the Italian prime minister, also took part in the trip to Sicily.

Thousands of people carrying flowers, flags and streamers welcomed the Soviet visitors. A huge floral panel of 25,000 carnations representing the state flags of the USSR and Italy adorned the building of the municipal council. A wreath was laid in a ceremony at the plaque commemorating Russian naval personnel who were the first to help Messina residents following a devastating quake in 1908. The Soviet guests visited an exhibition devoted to those distant events. On display were photographs and archive documents.

The city's public representatives gathered at the municipal council's ceremonial hall. Survivors of the Messina earthquake were invited as guests of honour. The meeting was attended by members of the Italian Government, regional and local authorities, political parties and nongovernmental organisations.

The chairman of Messina's Provincial Council, Giuseppe Naro, announced the decision to give to the Soviet Union a tomograph bought with the money raised by the local inhabitants during a campaign of solidarity with the Armenian quake victims. The tomograph will be installed in a children's hospital in Kirovakan.

Addressing the audience, Raisa Gorbachev said:

"Many hardships have befallen Sicily, but the most heinous was the 1908 earthquake. The calamity was

described to the world by our great author Maksim Gorkiy. Our people have had to live through the horror of earthquakes on several occasions. I will never forget the crying and moaning, the shock and tears, the thousands of lives and hopes wasted in a split second in Spitak, Leninakan and Kirovakan. The entire world shared the tragedy of Armenia and our common pain. Italy was the first country to extend a helping hand. That was the hand of the citizens of Sicily, of the citizens of Messina. We express our profound gratitude for the humanitarian solidarity and charity. We believe: those who are united by sorrow are able to make a step, probably the most important step, in the name of peace and life on earth."

Giuseppe Colotta, a member of the local chapter of the Italy-USSR Society, addressed the guests and other people who gathered in front of the municipal council building. "We will all remember this day for a long time," he said. "We are glad to welcome the Soviet people with whom we maintain close ties of friendship. I hope that our contacts will become even more successful and intensive."

"We, survivors of the 1908 quake rescued thanks to the courage of Russian sailors, see a special meaning in today's event," said Domenico Lanzafame, a witness of the Messina calamity. "The memory of the people who extended aid and gratitude to them live on in the hearts of Messina residents. It is only natural that they were among the first to respond to Armenia's pain."

Gorbachev Prefaces Italian Edition of Anthology

PM3011154989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS correspondent s dispatch: "Festive Ceremony in Rome"]

[Text] Rome, 29 Nov—A ceremony to launch M.S. Gorbachev's book "All-European Home," which has been published in Italian, was held at the premises of the joint press center of the Italian ADN-KRONOS NEWS AGENCY and the "NOVOSTI" PRESS AGENCY (APN) in Rome on 28 November. The book contains interviews, speeches, and articles by M.S. Gorbachev. The book was jointly prepared by APN and Italy's leading publishing trust Mondadori.

It opens with an address to Italian readers:

On the eve of my visit to Italy, the Mondadori Publishing House decided to publish an anthology of several of my statements in the last few years and asked me to provide an address to the readers.

A book like this probably needs no explanations by the author: The speeches and statements, and especially the issues associated with them, should speak for themselves. Nonetheless, having looked at the material chosen for publication, I would like to express a few opinions.

I keep thinking to myself: How swiftly and how sharply everything in the world is changing in the late 80's! Much of what hardly seemed feasible in Europe just 1-2 years ago has either already become reality or is on the agenda of current political work. An entire class of nuclear weapons is being eliminated. It seems likely that an agreement on a radical reduction of conventional arms and armed forces will be concluded next year. Ties between European countries have acquired truly unprecedented features as regards their diversity and intensiveness. In brief, Europe is taking confident steps along the path to overcoming hostility, splits, and confrontation. There are grounds for hope that the era symbolized by the "iron curtain" is being replaced by an era to be symbolized by the all-European home.

I think that this became possible, first, because a sober view of the world has finally prevailed. People have sensed its growing integrity and the interdependence of different states, they have started realizing the vital importance of universal human values. Second, the Europeans—like many inhabitants of other continents, have started appreciating time, becoming increasingly better aware that if we wish to save civilization and life on earth itself, we must restructure ourselves for a new system of relations, for new norms and rules of these relations, and must more quickly cast off the legacy of the "cold war."

From this point of view, many of the specific ideas, evaluations, and proposals contained in the book can be perceived today as a reminder of the path that has already been traversed. But I think that readers will also find in it the long-term goals and foreign policy principles of the USSR, stemming from our new thinking.

Within a brief period of time Europe has accumulated some most valuable experience and we Europeans—and not just we—should not forget this. This experience is instructive and can serve as a source of realistic optimism. No matter how great the difficulties, contradictions, and threats still hanging over us might be, they are surmountable. This is proved by the recent history of European relations and of international relations as a whole, and it is to a certain extent reflected in this book.

Naturally, much attention in the book is devoted to relations between Italy and the USSR. They have been and still are developing well, to the benefit of both sides. Moreover, Soviet-Italian cooperation is steadily acting as a constructive and inalienable element of the European process and world politics. I hope that my visit to your country will bring the Soviet and Italian peoples even closer together, will expand and deepen the ties and collaboration between our states, and will help to ensure that the Soviet-Italian factor serves mankind better still.

Falin on German Reunification, One-Party Rule

AU0412115589 Hamburg BILD in German
4 Dec 89 p 3

[Interview with Gorbachev adviser Valentin Falin by Wolfgang Kenntemich: "Falin: The Development Is Normal"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] BILD: Is reunification still on the agenda following the Malta summit?

Falin: Well, people are discussing it. So, it is on the agenda. However, this issue is not on the agenda of practical politics. The normalization of relations between the two German states is a process. Without normalization and understanding, this movement in the direction of the problems that the politicians and the public in both parts of Germany have in mind will not be possible.

BILD: What else do you expect to happen in the GDR?

Falin: I think that only outsiders did not expect this development in the GDR. Many people in the GDR and the FRG assumed long ago that such a thing would happen.

BILD: The Socialist Unity Party of Germany has given up its leadership claim. Does that worry Moscow?

Falin: No, that is a normal development. In a country with several parties, it was not logical for one party to claim this and even lay it down in the Constitution. In our Constitution, such a thesis was also laid down in the 70's. That is politically unfounded. In the amendment to our Constitution, such artificial paragraphs will not appear any more.

Austrian Leaders Welcome Malta Meeting Results

LD0412093189 Moscow TASS in English 0755 GMT
4 Dec 89

[Text] Vienna December 4 TASS—The Malta summit between Presidents' Gorbachev and Bush raised hopes that an important step towards a stable peace throughout the world has been made, Austrian Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky said on Sunday [3 December] commenting on the results of the meeting.

The success of Malta meeting is not just a personal victory of both leaders and their states, but of entire mankind as well, he added.

The development of a direct dialogue between U.S. and Soviet leaders, which is aimed to unite efforts of the two great powers in order to solve topical problems, bodes well for the successful settlement of many regional conflicts, Austrian Foreign Minister Alois Mock told the APA News Agency.

He expressed hope that the summit would accelerate the Vienna negotiations on conventional armed forces reduction in Europe.

Soviet Problems Cause Austrian Visit Postponement

AU0212175989 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German
2-3 Dec 89 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Feverishness in the Kremlin: No Time for Mock"]

[Text] The trip to Moscow by Foreign Minister Mock planned for December, which was expected with great attention, has had to be postponed because of the turbulent developments in Moscow. Mock was to have met with Kremlin leader Gorbachev in the middle of December in his capacity as chairman of the European Democratic Union. However, Gorbachev has canceled all the dates because of the session of the People's Congress at this time.

Academician on Space Cooperation With France

PM0412135189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 Nov 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 5

[Yuriy Kovalenko dispatch under the "Correspondents Comment" rubric: "France-USSR: What's the Cost of a 'Space Ticket'?"]

[Text] Paris—In the opinion of specialists, this year proved extremely fruitful for Franco-Soviet space cooperation, and both countries are fully determined to continue it in the future. A third joint manned flight and a new program for Mars research are in prospect.

These two projects were examined at the annual—26th—Franco-Soviet meeting on space, which has just been held in the Pyrennean town of Saint-Jean-de-Luz. Commenting on this meeting, the Parisian press notes that the time of free flights for French crewmen on Soviet spacecraft is over. Henceforth, the newspapers write, France will have to pay $10 million per week for the "ticket."

The Soviet side, citing the fact that this is a "commercial secret," prefers not to discuss in public the cost of a seat on the craft. Those are indeed our rates now, a Soviet participant in the meeting confirmed, but there has as yet been no discussion of concrete figures with the French side. When we begin to consider figures, we will not, of course, fail to take into consideration the fact that our cooperation with France in the study of space began more than 20 years ago and has proved possible due to common efforts to achieve great scientific successes here.

"The French," Academician V.A. Kotelnikov, chairman of the "Intercosmos" Council, pointed out, "have invested hundreds of millions of francs in our joint programs. If we had not cooperated with them but had done everything ourselves, the space experiments would have been considerably less effective. By and large we have derived mutual advantage from this cooperation. Moreover, our joint work with French scientists has enabled us to make a critical assessment of our own

program and elaborate a common viewpoint on the problem of developing space science."

Although cosmonauts and scientists are, of course, primarily interested in scientific rather than commercial and financial questions, the latter are also extremely important. For instance, budgetary constraints may prove a serious obstacle in the implementation of various projects.

In accordance with the summit accords, Soviet-French space studies are carried out within the framework of a 10-year program. In addition to joint flights, this makes provision, in particular, for study of the environment via satellite, medical and biological studies in space, and a number of other areas.

"We intend," V.A. Kotelnikov said, "to devote particular attention to three new areas of space study associated with our planet. They are study of the energies [energetika] and chemical composition of the earth's atmosphere (in particular, the ozone layer, by means of a laser), and last the influence of the earth's surface on energy transfer processes. Since 1966, when the first intergovernmental agreement on space was signed, a total of more than 60 joint projects have been implemented. Now virtually all research programs have become multilateral—that is, other states have joined with France and the Soviet Union.

"Whereas all the indications are that a new joint program linked with the study of Mars will begin in 1994, the launch of the 'Granat' Soviet artificial satellite is intended for 1 December this year. A telescope will be installed onboard to study X-rays. The studies conducted using this telescope will," Academician V.A. Kotelnikov explained, "help clarify our notions of the properties of matter and, in particular, the universe."

As for a final agreement on a third joint space flight lasting approximately 14 days, it will be signed in a few weeks in Moscow. This flight will probably take place at the end of 1992.

Jean-Loup Chretien, who has twice taken part in joint voyages, has just been appointed adviser on manned flights to the president of France's National Space Research Center. He will head the detachment of French astronauts that is to be formed. But Michel Tonini, J.L. Chretien's understudy on the last flight, has the best chance of going into space today.

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. Evacuation, El Salvador Situation Viewed

PM3011212589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Second Edition p 7

[Pavel Bogomolov "Observer's Opinion" under the general heading "El Salvador: Fighting Has Flared Up With New Force"]

[Text] Judging by news agency reports, the development of events in El Salvador has reached an extremely dangerous point. President Cristiani's refusal to respond to the insurgents' recent cease-fire proposal has resulted in a fresh outbreak of bloodshed.

Having rejected out of hand last week the very idea of the resumption of talks with the Farabundo Marti Liberation Movement, the government has made no secret of its intention of quickly driving the guerrillas back into the mountains using U.S. military supplies. "Elite" army battalions had already prepared for punitive assaults. But what happened? The regime's gamble on military force proved futile. The insurgents regrouped their forces, brought up reserves, and struck a powerful new blow.

The Salvadoran drama is increasingly sharply at variance with the improvement of the international climate. Representatives of the United Nations, the OAS, the EEC, the Vatican, France, and a number of other countries and organizations are now stressing the acute need to urge the warring sides in El Salvador to reach a peaceful settlement based on mutual compromise. And it is a very great pity that such an appeal has not come from that capital which the Salvadoran authorities heed above all others—Washington.

Attention is drawn to the urgent evacuation of U.S. citizens from El Salvador that was announced yesterday. I recognize that in the conditions of an armed conflict this is a necessary step. But it is no secret that in the recent past such actions by the U.S. Administration were an ominous symptom of the preparation of overtly interventionist plans.

End the bloodshed—that is the priority task today. And the restoration of the dialogue between the government and the insurgents that was broken off should be the first step toward that.

U.S. Ban on Panamanian Ships Part of 'Crusade'

PY0312024589 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish 0330 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Marina Petrovskaya commentary]

[Text] President Bush has banned the entrance of Panamanian ships into U.S. ports as of 1 February 1990. The White House spokesman said that this economic measure is aimed at undermining the position of the de facto President, General Noriega. Here are Marina Petrovskaya's comments on the topic:

U.S. retaliations against Panama have cost the country several million dollars. But it is not true that the latest Yankee retaliation was based merely on economic reasons, because any economic measure [words indistinct] strong political connotations.

We must remember that the United States started its anti-Panamanian crusade with several types of economic measures: freezing Panamanian deposits in U.S. banks,

banning imports of Panamanian-made products, and other measures that sought more than anything else to destabilize the Panamanian Republic politically, to undermine the Panamanian people's confidence in their government, and to thus oust the current government [words indistinct].

Despite all that, Washington did not achieve its goals. Despite all the economic difficulties, Panamanians continue to fully support their government. [Words indistinct] offer complete support.

It has just been reported that the Panamanian [words indistinct] has elected General Antonio Noriega as national coordinator. There are 510 deputies who have also decided to name Noriega as government head. [Words indistinct] current government declared the state of siege in view of the continued Yankee aggression. As a matter of fact, Washington's policies toward Panama make us fear for the security and the future of the country.

While provocations in other (?areas) continue, [words indistinct] Gringo soldiers [word indistinct] in a Panamanian hospital or the blocking of [words indistinct] government institutions.

The Panamanian Foreign Ministry considered this to be another excuse to continue threatening to intervene in Panama. This is what the Panamanian Foreign Ministry stated in a letter to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar. In the letter Panama again calls the UN's attention to the inadmissible U.S. attitude, particularly because it is increasingly more threatening. [Words indistinct] the United States has behaved as the owner and master of the Panama Canal Zone, it has now started to cause disorders in the capital city.

We cannot forget the role of Gringo citizens in the plotting for the recent frustrated coup d'etat in Panama, when U.S. tanks were deployed along the main roads leading to the Panamanian capital.

It is hard to predict the future of Panamanian-U.S. relations, but it has been made very clear that the Panamanians will never (?agree to be governed) by Washington, no matter how serious the economic, political, and military crises Panama may have to face.

Political & Social

Lithuanian Party Plenum Proceedings Reported

Medvedev Notes 'Dangerous Trends'

LD0112140589

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0800 GMT on 1 December carries a live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum attended by CPSU Politburo Member Vadim Medvedev.

The proceedings are opened by Lithuanian Communist Party First Secretary Brazauskas, who gives an account in Russian of the recent meeting in Moscow between Lithuanian Politburo members and CPSU Politburo members. He recalls the document adopted at the meeting which points out the dangers facing Lithuania, and the need for the Lithuanian Commnist Party to take steps to remedy the situation prior to the next Lithuanian Communist Party congress. He then introduces Medvedev who speaks of Politburo concerns over dangerous trends within the Lithuanian Comunist Party—nationalism, federalism, tendencies toward social democracy, and schism. Medvedev insists that the Lithuanian Communist Party take measures to eliminate these dangers and achieve unity, and points out that republican communist parties have rights within the CPSU.

Speaking of the dangers, Medvedev says: "recently there has been a sharp stepping up of attempts to weaken or even to break off ties between the republic and the center. In this unusual, complex situation the question of the republic's Communist Party's activity is being posed in a new way. Meanwhile, the party organization is not always arming the party aktiv and labor collectives in good time with clear political directions."

He continues: "many (?instructions) and resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee, including on the Lithuanian SSR, and recommendations from the center are not being brought to the attention of communists. It is noted that the bureau of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, and the first secretary of the Central Committee, Comrade Algirdas Kazevich Brazauskas, are prone to vacillations and inconsistency, and deviations from the (?promise) of the September plenum of the CPSU Central Committee."

Further, he says: "There is a process of dividing communists according to their nationality. Some of them are moving to positions of social democratic or even antisocialist persuasion. There has been a sharp increase in numbers leaving the party. As a result, the Lithuanian Communist Party is faced with a threat of split, and loss of influence among the people."

He concludes by saying: "The Politburo has expressed the hope that the Communists of Lithuania will display wisdom and a sense of balance, and will achieve a maintaining and strengthening of the republic's Communist Party as an organic part of the CPSU, and an enhancement of its role in the cause of genuine renewal of the republic's sociopolitical life."

Medvedev then reads an appeal to the plenum from M.S. Gorbachev.

Reads Gorbachev Message

LD0212195989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[Appeal by CPSU General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev entitled "To the Communists of Lithuania"]

[Text] Comrades!

Only 2 weeks remain before the congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania. That is not long, but it is sufficient time in which to think through, again and again, a program of action, taking into account the real situation in the republic, and to adjust reference points for the future, to weigh, calmly and wisely, the political steps that really follow from the demands of the time, that is, from life.

I know that a difficult situation has arisen in the republic and in the Communist Party. Many things call for creative quest, discussion, and nonstandard solutions. It is natural that the processes occurring in the republic are unfolding on the basis of perestroyka, of the general revolutionary transformations in the country, and of their achievements and difficulties.

But one must appreciate that the processes of perestroyka are going through a difficult time.

The old system of administration is no longer working while the new is not yet fully in order. The fact that the changes are not straightforward, and the shortage of goods, food, and housing prompt, give reason for sharp criticism, but at times also speculation.

I should not like either to gloss over, or to dramatize the situation: Perestroyka is, above all, a realistic appraisal of the state of society, of its problems and affairs. Moreover, it would be, to say the least, strange and unnatural if transformations, historic in scale, scope, and consequence, affecting literally everyone, were to develop without resistance and surprises, smoothly and evenly. That is no more than naive myth. That would not be revolution, but something radically different from it. And we would once more be indulging in wishful thinking.

Let us elucidate together where we stand today. A fundamentally new political situation has been created in our country, and it has released the colossal energy of public awareness. The processes of perestroyka are more and more being revolutionized. They have embraced practically all spheres of public life, and posed in a new way the questions of the forms and methods of the work of the CPSU and of the nature of intraparty relations.

Let us ask ourselves the simple question: What is all this for? In whose interests is it happening?

Perestroyka has been undertaken on the initiative of the party in order to give true practical embodiment to the socialist ideals of the humane and highly moral society, democratic law and order, human freedom, and equality and social justice for all. Today we see and understand, better than ever before in the history of our movement, how long and difficult, and how far from straightforward is the path to those eternal ideals of social revolutions and to those human values.

But we see something else: This path is realistic, the goals, common to all mankind, are attainable. The material and spiritual base from which further progress is possible has been created to a significant degree. We have worked intensively together, together we have rejoiced at the victories, together we have been sad because of failures, and together we have suffered because of mistakes and deviations from the Leninist concept of socialism. Together we have come to the conclusion of the necessity of perestroyka and renewal. Together we have begun the implementation of the policies of the 27th congress and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

Yes, each of us feels and understands that the processes of perestroyka are proceeding painfully. Yes, much of what had been accumulating for a long time and was hidden under a bushel, and denied, has splashed to the surface of public life. And the objective difficulties of perestroyka, the emotional reaction to them, are inevitable and undertandable. It could not be otherwise. This is the cost of previous errors and the acute shortage of mutual exactingness, of a culture of human relations, and real responsibility before the people. But all this, nevertheless, is just one aspect of reality, one group of reasons for the complications experienced.

Other aspects point toward the present day and tomorrow. Yes, we are now having to pay for the past—both recent and distant. But it is necessary to understand: We would certainly have to pay for it in any event... with perestroyka or without it. But only perestroyka opens up the fundamental possibility of insuring oneself for the future against a repetition of something similar. Only perestroyka, with its support in the democratic forms of development, opens up prospects for reducing to a minimum all the costs that are inevitable here. In other conditions the phenomena of crisis, I have no doubt, could end in an explosion, which would lead to serious, possibly tragic consequences.

And so, to the idea behind perestroyka:

- Through **democratization** to ensure that the people have a full voice and sovereignty at every level;
- Through **legality** to create a law-governed society and state in which the supreme principle of civilization—human freedom—is triumphant;
- To create an **economy** in line with mankind's historically justified experience and the real level of development of the country and of each region, optimally combining diverse forms of ownership and economic relations and thereby opening up all the sluice gates to initiative, healthy enterprise, genuine economic self-reliance, and independence of people, collectives and territories;
- To transform **social relations** in such a way that remuneration according to labor and to the personal contribution of each is combined with sensible social guarantees of the vital rights of people who are truly in need of such protection, that no place remains in society for dependency, levelling-down, all possible forms of concealed parasitism on others' labor, hanging-on, and sponging;
- And as a result—to profoundly alter the way of life, its qualities and social morality, and to tap the potential of the socialist system.

Perestroyka's reference point is also the new political thinking, constructive and creative integration of the country into the world system, into global economic structures. Primarily, this concerns the prospects for the creation of a peaceful and prosperous all-European home, which can only be based on an unshakable recognition of the realities of European politics, on the continuation and consolidation of the Helsinki process.

Such are the aims, the bearings, the components of perestroyka. And such is its practice. Difficult, contradictory, not without its own slips and errors, but sincere and generally moving us forward to the outlined frontiers, to a more worthy life.

But it is necessary to realize the following: In a historical time scale, we are still at the very source of renewal. The forces of intertia, conservatism, braking, and greed, which oppose it are great and far from broken. They are putting the brakes on, and in some places are simply sabotaging perestroyka. Dangers are also lurking for us on the other side. We see that irresponsible political adventurists and demagogues, corrupt and criminal elements, opponents of socialism, nationalists and chauvinists of all colors, and fallen social elements are wishing, and frequently manage, to avail themselves of the fruits of glasnost and democracy. And thus the question can only be phrased as follows: Will the forces of perestroyka and renewal prove capable of acting together and in the same direction, furthering, in unity and cohesion, the processes of recovery of public life and of giving it normal human qualities? Or will various aspirations to exploit the first fruits of perestroyka for certain private goals and to squander its political, moral, and practical capital prevail?

One may have no doubt: In the first case the restructuring processes will go broad and deep, and the further they go, the closer they will bring us to the goals that we all share. In the second case, they not only will slow down or even stop, but also the prerequisites will be created for revival and strengthening of command-and-administer

structures, and of authoritarian methods of administration at territorial, regional, and republican levels.

The issue stands precisely thus, comrade communists!

Satisfaction is evoked in the Politburo, and in me personally, by the fact that the new CPSU policy enjoys broad support from the communists and working people of Soviet Lithuania, and is being implemented in the republic's concrete deeds. It is an indisputable fact that the perestyroyka processes are actively unfolding in Lithuania, just as in the entire country. In some things, they are ahead of similar processes in other regions, and sometimes are displayed in more acute forms. Public and political life in the republic is lively. It is full of a richness of shades, opinions, and various positions. Inveterate political and social problems, which for long were not resolved, have been moved off the mark. The rate of socioeconomic transformations have accelerated. The republic is acquiring its own face, an individual image, a genuine independence.

These results, which even recently were difficult to imagine, are undoubtedly based primarily on the labor and efforts of all the people of the republic, and on the activity of its Communist Party and of Lithuania's public forces. However, no one surely would dispute either that it would have been difficult to imagine these unprecedented advances without the historic and revolutionary initiative of the CPSU—the policy of 1985.

The Politburo supports the creative quests, the real changes, and the real achievements in the activity of the Communist Party of Lithuania. But it is not one of the traditions of communists to keep silent about worrying moments which accompany the processes of renewal. They have occurred. They are occurring. Let us be frank. The growth in isolationist and separatist trends which are appearing in the sociopolitical life of the republic and attempts to make processes occurring in Lithuania run counter to the general course of our perestroyka are giving rise to particular anxiety. The practice of manipulating public awareness and the aspiration of certain groups to monopolize glasnost, as well as attempts to compromise the very idea of socialism and sow distrust in the CPSU are giving rise to serious worry. In some places the threat of a split in party organizations along national lines is becoming a reality.

Of course you understand, and understand full well, that this cannot leave communists in other republics and throughout the party indifferent. Inevitably it touches on highly sensitive political, economic, and indeed emotional ties which have long united our society and state in a single organism. To a still greater extent this concerns a party which, regardless of how much criticism it is receiving today, has raised the people to the revolution of perestroyka on behalf of the interests of the working masses.

What are the current concerns of the population of the republic, and what demands are the communists of lithuania putting forward?

They are calling for the legacy of the administrative-bureaucratic system to be overcome most rapidly. They are calling for space to be provided for developing production forces, for full use to be made of the creative and labor potential of the republic and its workers, and for independent, uninhibited national development, as well as the opportunity to formulate and define for themselves its direction, forms and tempo, to preserve their individuality, to defend their national language and culture, and to freely develop ties with all the peoples of the USSR and the outside world. They are calling for further progress along the road of democracy, of really safeguarding human rights, of building a society based on law, asserting glasnost, and raising political culture.

Surely these aims and program demands are no different from the main thrust of our common cause, the cause of perestroyka? Do they not coincide with similar aspirations of peoples of other Soviet republics? Surely these are the very aims that were clearly and unambiguously formulated as program aims by the party leadership, which pledged to see the socialist renewal of society through to the end?

What is it with which Lithuanian public circles disagree and do not wish to come to terms? What are they protesting?

They are protesting the legacy of Stalinism, including that of the crimes committed by Stalinist leadership against the Lithuanian people. They protest manifestations of now-obsolete centralism, against instances of restrictions on the republic's independence and its sovereignty. They protest bureaucratic oppression, a levelling attitude toward the republic's specific features and the national aspirations of its population.

But the party's policy now precisely aims to overcome all this, as well as solving the nationalities issue, according to a program endorsed at the September CPSU Central Committee Plenum and in line with practical steps being taken by the USSR Supreme Soviet to refine the federal union.

It turns out that some people are already rejecting a genuine and democratic federation without having had the chance to live in one or without testing its viability. They reject it at the very time when, thanks to perestroyka, a historic opportunity has appeared to construct interethnic relations on a clean and firm basis determined by the freely expressed will of the people. This is an opportunity to create a genuinely new socialist federation in which the very structure and the nature of intrafederal links and relations would act as a guarantor of the self-preservation and development of each nation, ensuring that they have the opportunity of equal cooperation for the common good and for common aims.

As sovereign socialist states of the federation, the Union republics are acquiring the very broadest real rights. They are empowered to tackle all issues concerning state and public life. A policy of ensuring their economic independence has been firmly adopted. This opens up

before the Lithuanian people broad opportunities for the democratization of economic management, the reinforcement of the material basis of the republic's economy, the choice of different forms of ownership, efficient methods and systems of economic management, the development of commodity-money relations, and the all-round utilization of the advantages of the all-union market. A federation in process of renewal creates all the prerequisites for the free development of spiritual life, national originality, and the satisfaction of the cultural needs and demands of Soviet people.

In the conditions of the profound perestroyka in society and in the party itself, of course, questions of the internal party life of the CPSU are being resolved and will be resolved in a new way. There is no doubt that every communist party should have its own combat plan of action which would take into account the specific features of the republic, its national and other features. It goes without saying that the expansion of the rights and of the independence of the republican communist parties is necessary, including here also questions of financing their activity, the determination of the structures and staff, press, and other bodies. Obviously, it should be stressed once again that the impulses for these transformations have come from perestroyka.

All of this presupposes the creation of a fundamentally new mechanism of mutual relations between the union and republican state and party organizations, social organizations, and also with other republican and national state formations and labor collectives.

Everyone will gain from the renewal of the union. This is why it is so important to move along the path of enhancing independence together, rather than separately, basing ourselves upon the values of self-renewing socialism. Of course, this takes time. It is impossible to resolve this task at once. But the main thing is to be guided by the requirements of real life—not by speculative plans. The question is legitimate: If we agree that our fundamental goals are the same, what is the best way for us to achieve them; separately or together? Do not the common historical goal and communist morality require the unification of efforts on the part of everyone who has resolutely taken the side of perestroyka in this country today?

It is a profound error to suppose that we will achieve our goals more quickyl if we disperse, move into our "national apartments," and become immersed in our own problems, passions, and moods. This will not happen either with the country as a whole or with its separate parts, with society, or still less with the party. History will make this illusion vanish. But no one will get any relief from this. On the contrary, the sum of the sociopolitical payment accounts will only increase.

Extremism in politics is a dangerous thing. We have discovered this truth through our own experience. It is not only seen in the violence of passions; it also appears in the promotion of political goals. Such goals are not supported by possibilities; they are not formulated in the interests of social development but in truth contradict them. Historical experience shows us how dangerous it is to tear ideas and goals away from reality and how fatally this can affect the social destiny of ideas and movement toward these goals. I am convinced that only together, by following the principles of internationalism, the testament of Lenin, the logic of political struggle and finally common sense, is it possible in the most effective way and in the shortest possible time to overcome the difficulties of the transitional period of perestroyka and lead our country and Soviet society into a new level of development.

I know that not everyone in the Lithuanian Communist Party agrees with such an approach. loud appeals to sever the republic's links with the center and isolate the republic's Communist Party are heard. The efforts of central party and state bodies aimed at strengthening the sovereignty of the republics and increasing the independence of their communist parties are being deliberately understated. The restoration of independent statehood and the formation of a republican Communist Party independent of the CPSU are being seen as a saving goal in themselves. Historical facts, the demands of the present day, and the prospects for development are being adjusted to fit this, often tendentiously. At the same time, the actual development Lithuanian economy and culture during the years of Soviet power is being negated.

Neither have all the consequences of such a step—economic, political, cultural and moral—been measured. Surely no one actually supposes that the logic of struggle will stop the development of the situation at the "separation" stage?

To go down that path, to act on hasty arguments and ill-considered assessments, would be pernicious in the extreme. If we are in agreement on what matters most, and united in essentials, what, then, is the subject of our differences—is it really just forms, slogans, and appeals, however vigorous?

Incidentally, we are unfortunately only now emerging from the time when forms and slogans obscured and overwhelmed content, and gained the upper hand over real life, when reality was sacrificed to a false understanding of political interests.

Perestroyka has not only posed the key questions of our social being, but is solving them in a new way. But we have not yet passed the fork on the road into the future. Where the country and society will go, and how, depends crucially upon the position and unity of the party, and of every communist, and upon our common ability to restructure the entire work of the CPSU. And at the same time to preserve and consolidate in the new conditions all that which, for almost a century, has enabled the party to carry out its historic mission and bear its responsibility to the people. Today the CPSU is the force without which it is inconceivable that we could overcome the interethnic conflicts that have accumulated over decades, or reconcile the interests of the various social

strata and groups of the population. That is why the CPSU Central Committee Politburo considers it necessary to say now, with all responsibility and conviction: The restoration of an independent state outside the framework of the USSR and the creation on this prospective of a Communist Party of the republic independent from the CPSU would cancel out the results of the real development of Lithuania, of its economy and culture, during the years of Soviet power. It would call into question the substantial buttresses of the postwar European home, a home brought to fruition with difficulty and not yet stable enough, and even in some way a fragile home, a peaceful home, now going through a difficult transformation. The CPSU Central Committee is convinced that the division of communists according to national and social status is inadmissible and unacceptable: That would contradict the very essence of internationalist socialism and the interests of the people.

In politics, one should not take steps without taking account of their consequences, without taking upon oneself the responsibility for those real results to which, sooner or later, they will lead. In this case, any hasty, unilateral steps that have not been thought through will not yield the desired results, I am convinced. On the contrary, any movement toward division will inevitably strike a most serious blow to perestroyka, moreover, for it, in a most difficult and crucial period.

The forces consolidating society and uniting all working people will inevitably weaken, and this can only have extremely negative consequences for our common socialist achievements.

As never before we need unity, party comradeship, and a joint increase in input in the solution of the tasks of perestroyka. Only a united party of internationalists representing all the peoples of the USSR and defending their common and national interests on the basis of its platform on the nationalities policy can be a guarantee for the renewal of the country, the consolidation on this platform of all the healthy forces in society and of the national revival and progress of each people with simultaneous harmonious development of interethnic relations. Having firmly taken the course of raising the status and responsibility of the union republics' communist parties, it continues to see itself as ideologically and organizationally one, with a common program and statutes constructed on the principles of the equality of rights of citizens of all nationalities.

Comrade communists! We all bear the responsibility for the destiny of perestroyka, the party, and our Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I call on you to show wisdom and consideration, to put all your efforts into preventing a split in party ranks, to ensure the socialist direction of the processes of national revival of the Lithuanian people, the satisfaction of the hopes of the representatives of all the nationalities living in the republic, and remove the alarm and deep concern of the country's communists and working people.

Every CPSU member, no matter what part of the country he is in, no matter what position he holds, and no matter what nationality, must today decide: Is he prepared to devote all his efforts to the common task of the revolutionary renewal of society, is he prepared to distinguish truly popular, including national, interests from the various kinds of foam that have appeared on the wave of renewal, and is he prepared to decisively oppose those destructive and irresponsible forces, the activization of which is capable of throwing us all back and threatens to slam the door to the renewed future.

As you see, I have sincerely shared with you the considerations that arose from the analysis of the situation in the republic's Communist Party. In this politically strained atmosphere the value of responsibility before history and the people is particularly high. I wish all Lithuanian Communists success and hope that the 20th congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party will have a weighty input into the development of the conceptions of the 28th CPSU Congress. Walking separately is the path to nowhere. Only together and only forward to a humane, democratic, flourishing society.

With communist greetings.
[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Medvedev Elaborates

PM0112232189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum: Act Together"]

[Text] Vilnius, 1 Dec—A Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee plenum has been held here today. It was attended by V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who read out the text of a message to Lithuania's Communists from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee (the message will be published in the central press).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, who delivered the report, dwelt on problems of the preparation for the extraordinary Lithuanian Communist Party congress due in December. The discussion which then began reflected the contradictory and ambiguous nature of the renewal processes in the republic and its Communist Party. Various views were expressed on the future of the Lithuanian Communist Party and its role and place in the restructuring of all spheres of society's life and in the process of giving real content to the republic's sovereignty.

V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the plenum.

Today's plenum and yesterday's meetings, which were also held in a frank and keen atmosphere, show that the problems broached in M.S. Gorbachev's message to Lithuania's Communists and during the meeting at the

CPSU Central Committee Politburo are of really fundamental significance for Lithuania's Communist Party and the whole republic.

In the weeks ahead an answer must be given to the question: Is the republic's Communist Party going to continue acting within the general party course of perestroyka or does it prefer the path of isolation and separate actions from the CPSU? That is the question.

The essence of the present situation in the country and our attitude to what is happening in the republic have been characterized in detail in M.S. Gorbachev's message to Lithuania's Communists. Perhaps the main thing should be emphasized just once more—perestroyka has really reached a critical point. And whereas its first 3 years were essentially in the nature of a quest and we didn't approach the question of the transformation of the political and economic systems in full until the 19th All-Union Party Conference, now these processes are developing in their full depth, reality, complexity, and contradictoriness.

We are convinced that only the continuation of perestroyka, only the path of the further democratization of our society, and only the path of the renewal of socialism offer the possibility of a constructive and democratic solution of all the problems that we are encountering today. And we cannot let that opportunity slip. But if centrifugal tendencies prevail on a nationwide or republic scale, that will mean the end of perestroyka both in terms of our internal development and of our new role in the international community. And it would be naive to believe that in that case people will be able to sit it out in their cozy little corner, in their own national compartment. Such a development of events can be averted only by our common joint efforts.

Do we have a specific program of action? Yes, we do. First and foremost it proposes removing the most painful sources of discontent in the socioeconomic sphere. This means the normalization of the market and financial recovery. In addition to economic recovery the solution of such tasks as normalizing interethnic relations and implementing party reform are of crucial significance for the fate of perestroyka.

The urgency of interethnic relations is obvious to all. When raising this question one is bound to talk about the crude distortions of Lenin's nationalities policy permitted in the past, the unitarist tendencies in the federative organization of our state which reduced national characteristics and interests to a common denominator, and the diktat of central departments. Nor can one forget the deep injury inflicted by the mass repressions and the lawlessness on the lives of the peoples. The Lithuanian people were not spared that fate either.

Our party resolutely condemns that. It advocates the revival of Leninist principles of a federation of sovereign peoples in the light of present-day realities, of course. The CPSU's new nationalities policy embodied in the party platform on nationalities questions adopted by the September plenum restores the Leninist principles of the self-determination of the nations to their rightful place. Self-determination cannot be interpreted as a one-shot act or be reduced simply to separation, it means a process of national revival in concrete historical conditions and concrete forms and real social ties.

Of course, the party's present-day nationalities policy does not boil down to the simple revival of Leninist principles but proposes combining them with the real processes of social development and with that vast experience of the peoples' life and labor together, the historic path which it [as published] has traveled, and the existing system of economic, scientific, cultural, and spiritual reciprocal ties. It is impossible to turn away from all that and simply go back 70 or 50 years.

Together we endured the most difficult war, which threatened the very existence of our peoples, caused incalculable casualties and sufferings, and was marked by the joint struggle against fascism. It must not be forgotten that in Lithuania alone the Nazis wiped out around 500,000 civilians and 200,000 prisoners of war. Tens of thousands of people from the Baltic region were forcibly deported to Germany. Around 138,000 Red Army soldiers of many nationalities died just during the liberation of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] from fascist occupation.

It was by joint efforts that the republic's charred cities and villages were raised from the ruins, a powerful modern industry was created, and agricultural production was rapidly increased. Formerly backward Lithuania was transformed by the labor of its people with the whole country's help into a well equipped region with a high intellectual potential. The republic's national economy is linked by thousands of threads to the country's economic complex.

So, is all this to be discarded at a stroke? For what? Why should the past, no matter how contradictory it was, serve only to disunite us? I believe that it should be fully taken into account and that the best things produced by decades of life together should be taken from it and reinforced while resolutely rejecting all which has harmed our relations.

The leadership of the party and the country treated the processes of the republic's renewal, national rebirth, and democratization with attention and great understanding from the very outset. We saw the full complexity of these processes and respected your wish to examine the situation yourselves without external interference. We understood that it takes time to consider everything, to weigh it up, to make the right decisions. I do not think that anyone can accuse us of intolerance or opposing the growth of national self-consciousness . But I say frankly that we are increasingly worried by the fact that these processes are accompanied by a growth in extreme views [kraynost] of the kind that hold that state independence from the USSR is the only path to the national rebirth of the Lithuanian people.

I believe that we must keep sight of the main point that without restructuring it is impossible to resolve the nationalities question and, in turn, without the harmonization of national relations it is impossible to implement the program for the renewal of socialism.

V.A. Medvedev stressed the significance for broadening the republic's sovereignty of the Law on the Economic Independence of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian SSR's adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. You will have noticed, I think, the nature and trenchancy of the debates on this question, he noted. To positively resolve the question the party had to display great political will. And I can assure you that this will also be the case in the future.

At the forefront of perestroyka right now, V.A. Medvedev continued, are the problems of reshaping the party and radically changing the content, style, and methods of its work. In conditions when a citizens' society and a rule-of-law state are taking shape the party simply cannot change its place and role in society, its complexion, its structure, its entire system of interrelationships with state and social organizations.

The point of this profound process is that the party is being transformed from a kind of directing nucleus of the political system into the political vanguard force of society which formulates its policy, presents it to the people, struggles for support for this policy, and organizes its fulfillment through Communists working in various spheres and components of the social mechanism.

To put it briefly, this requires, first, a radical change in the relations between the party and state organs, the precise delineation of their functions, and the renunciation by the party of direct administrative functions. Second, the restructuring of the party's relations with all other social organizations, the development of political dialogue with them, and the ruling out of tendencies to give orders and commands. Third, the bold and resolute democratization of all intraparty life and organizational, cadre, and ideological work, the creation of conditions for a natural and free struggle of opinions, and the elaboration of guarantees that the opinion of the minority will be taken into account—naturally, on a common ideological basis and given compulsory fulfillment of adopted decisions. Fourth, a substantial shift of rights and functions between central party organizations and other levels of the party organism, the expansion of the rights of primary party organizations and also rayon, city, and oblast party organizations, and of course, independence of action [samostoyatelnost] of union republic communist parties.

First and foremost broad independence of action of republic communist parties must be ensured in the political sphere. Proposals that republic communist parties should also have political programs within the framework of a common party program merit attention. I am also talking about the broadening of republic communist parties' independence of action in cadre policy and the resolution of material and financial questions. There are no problems or aspects of the process of increasing the independence of action of union republic communist parties that could not be examined in the course of precongress discussion, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed.

Only the first steps have been taken along the path of reshaping the party. A tremendous amount of work lies ahead, particularly during the period of preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress, and we expect, hope, and are confident that the Communists of all republics will make their contribution to this process.

It must be said, V.A. Medvedev noted, that on this occasion too your plenum also shows that many questions of party democratization—the principles governing action, organizational structure, intraparty relations, and so forth—are the subject of lively and trenchant debate in the Lithuanian Communist Party. This has been promoted by the party discussion in which we are engaged, a discussion which is yielding a considerable amount of instructive and useful things for the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

At the same time we share the concern at the increasingly noticeable tilt toward the creation of a communist party separate from the CPSU. This tendency has intensified since the adoption of the decision to convene the congress and particularly since the publication of the draft Lithuanian Communist Party statute, which is essentially the statute of a different party.

I wish to express myself absolutely frankly and definitely on this question. We favor broad independence of action for the Lithuanian Communist Party, as for other republics' communist parties. But at the same time we cannot fail to express our negative attitude to the desire to separate from the CPSU. Essentially this step can only be assessed as an expression of no confidence in the CPSU and its policy aimed at perestroyka. It can only be assessed as a blow to the party that was the initiator of perestroyka and is today the main sociopolitical factor for its implementation. Such a development of events cannot fail to have an impact on interethnic relations.

The desire for the Lithuanian Communist Party to separate does look logical: The republic's sovereignty—economic and political—is growing, and therefore the republic communist party's independence of action should be broadened. This is probably so, but the whole point is that only complete independence [nezavisimost] is being recognized as the sole acceptable form of independence of action. The argument for this is couched in terms of the interests of preserving the party's positions, its authority among the people, and its role as the leading force of socialist renewal. Allow me to express my doubts about this. I fear that this is a delusion and an unachievable illusion. The question arises: Is it possible at all to retain the republic Communist Party as a communist party outside the CPSU? Would it if not be swept away by other political forces which also claim to express the

Lithuanian people's national interests—forces by which it is already being squeezed? Would the party not be compelled to switch to other, fundamentally different political positions?

The formula of independence of action for a communist party within the CPSU retains the powerful support of the CPSU in all perestroyka initiatives and at the same time offers it broad scope for political creativity.

The Central Committee is open to any discussion, V.A. Medvedev stressed; moreover, we are acutely interested in such discussion as we move toward the congress. I can firmly assure you, comrades, that all the proposals and initiatives that the upcoming Lithuanian Communist Party Congress might submit, given such an approach, will be attentively examined in the course of the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

In conclusion the CPSU Central Committee secretary expressed confidence that the Central Committee plenum participants, the congress delegates, and all Lithunia's Communists will correctly understand the point and motives behind M.S. Gorbachev's message, display wisdom, balance, and supreme responsibility when adopting responsible political decisions, and do everything to preserve and strengthen the republic Communist Party while expanding its independence of action on the platform of a unified and renewed CPSU.

In the evening V.A. Medvedev gave a press conference for correspondents of central and local newspapers.

Medvedev Comments on Plenum

LD0212223989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum has ended. It made public Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's address to the communists of the republic. The text of the address is being published in the press. Here is a report from our correspondent, Paulyus, in Vilnius.

[Video shows meeting in progress and Medvedev speaking from the rostrum] [Paulyus] Here is the Vilnius Palace of Cultural Workers. Here, this morning a meeting was held between Comrade Medvedev and representatives of scientific and creative intelligentsia of Lithuania. Vadim Andreyevich answered numerous questions. These were sometimes pointed, categorical, and unbiased questions, the questions which representatives of our intelligentsia usually raise now whenever a conversation occasion arises. Many of them concerned the sovereignty of the republics, the independence of party organizations, and mutual relations between the center and the republics.

Comrade Medvedev noted that a radical restructuring of the USSR is under way in the direction toward each of them acquiring maximum independence in their development. But while living in self-contained national apartments, Vadim Andreyevich said, we must treat our common home carefully, as is appropriate for all good proprietors. The motto on the self-determination of the nationalities represents the real policy of the CPSU. But self-determination and separation are two different things. The CPSU Central Committee is in favor of every republican party organization tackling all questions itself relating to the life of the republic in question and taking an active part in tackling problems relating to the CPSU. The frank exchange of views between Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev and scientists, writers, and artists of Lithuania continued considerably longer than had been planned.

[Begin recording] [Paulyus] What are your thoughts and impressions as you leave?

[Medvedev] Judging by all the information and observations at hand, a certain deterioration has occurred here In the market and in trade. This, of course, can affect people's moods and the way they feel, and I would even say, the attitude toward the processes which are under way in the country. I think that there is a certain proportion of truth here and a certain proportion of something that should be supported. In other words, it is necessary to give the republics themselves the opportunity to handle their own economies and their own social issues, so as to let them take full responsibility for resolving these problems, and so that they do not have reason to reproach the center, that is Moscow and central powers. This is one thing.

On the other hand, there is something controversial here. No doubt it would be wrong to secede fully in tackling socioeconomic, political, and state-judicial tasks. This can simply harm the cause for we have a common economy. And for all the responsibility and self-reliance of the republics, there are many problems that can be tackled only together. Who can object to the expansion of self-reliance of the party in tackling the tasks which apply to the republic, for example In the elaboration of programs for the development of the republic and in addressing personnel matters and many internal party issues. This is right.

But at the same time in political processes one must not be distracted from the general stream of perestroyka under way in the country, because this is what creates a general background and general foundations for similar processes in the republic. [end recording]

Vorgashorskaya Miners Take Vote on Ending Strike

PM0112162389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the rubric "In the Pechora Coal Basin": "Debts Growing"]

[Excerpt] Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic—The situation in this northern mining city has

once again been exacerbated. Very contradictory opinions and suggestions have been voiced at various rallies and meetings here in recent days as to what the "Vorgashorskaya" Mine, which is continuing its strike, and the other miners' collectives which are working today should do now.

But it seems that ever-increasing numbers of working people of Vorkuta's coal-mining enterprises are beginning to heed the voice of reason and to understand that further strikes lead to an impasse and that it is necessary to try to resolve urgent socioeconomic problems and other demands that have been made in a calm, businesslike atmosphere. And the city's Communists are playing an increasingly active role in normalizing the situation.

A number of members of the "Vorgashorskaya" Mine strike committee are calling for a strike until the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and until their demands, which include political demands, are submitted to its platform. At one of the rallies they advanced, supposedly on behalf of the mine's entire collective, a resolution of no confidence in the country's government with a demand for its resignation. A general party meeting of the "Vorgashorskaya" Mine was held yesterday. The Communists did not support that resolution and proposed to the mine's working people that they reelect the strike committee. The resolution of the party meeting records that it regards as wrong the position of Communists who support strike calls in this situation. The Communists urged the entire mine collective to end the strike, to resume work at 0000 on 1 December, to get back into the normal production rhythm as quickly as possible, and to consider the preparations for "Vorgashorskaya's" switch to economic independence the chief task for today. At the meeting's suggestion, a secret ballot of all the mine's workers is now being conducted on this question.

This evening it is planned to hold a session of the coordinating council of members of the party committees of the mines, the machine plant, and the equipment installation and adjustment administration of the "Vorkutaugol" Association. [passage omitted]

Decision To End Strike Made

PM0212234989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 p 1

[Our correspondent V. Pantsyrev report: "Compromise Reached?"]

[Text] The long-awaited news has arrived: At midnight on 2 December the "Vorgashorskaya" mine, which has been on strike for 38 days, is returning to work.

Yesterday at the mine each shift began voting in a secret ballot. The vast majority of the miners voted to end the strike. After protracted talks the strike committee and the mine management finally reached agreement. The documents which arrived from Moscow transferring the "Vorgashorskaya" mine to full economic accountability and the direct contract with a West European firm on the sale of coal to it also played their part.

Increasingly frequently among the Vorkuta miners there is common-sense talk about the ability to achieve compromise in conflicts. Ending the strike is a practical step toward mutual understanding. The Vorkuta City workers committee has sent all the necessary registration documents to the city soviet executive committee. Incidentally, they were drawn up on the model of similar documents used by the workers committee in the Kuzbass which registered with the local soviet executive committee there.

These days at all the mines and enterprises in Vorkuta people are discussing a resolution of the city conference of labor collectives' representatives. Among other things it includes a proposal to found a union of working people of Vorkuta—a new from of workers movement. This idea is winning ever increasing support.

Strike Ends as Main Demand Met

LD0112183589 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Republic December 1 TASS—A general meeting of ministers at the Vorgashorskaya colliery has decided in early hours of December 1 to end their strike and resume work at midnight on December 2.

The decision was taken after a copy of the regulations, granting the largest of the Vorkuta mines independence and approved by Minister Mikhail Shchadov, was telefaxed to the miners of this, the last striking colliery in the Pechora coal basin.

The regulation grants to the Vorgashorskaya colliery full independence including the right to terminate its subordination to the Vorkutaugol (Coal) Association, on condition that it keeps filling state orders for deliveries of coal to consumers, a Vorkutaugol spokesman told TASS.

These provisions were among the strikers' principal demands.

The Vorgashorskaya colliery is expected to start independent operations on January 1, 1990.

The other mines of the Vorkutaugol Association are operating normally, but the consequences of the past stoppages continue to show—only five of the 12 operating mines fulfilled plan assignments for the last day in November.

Miners Resume Work

LD0212140789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1300 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Vorkuta (Komi ASSR) [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], 2 Dec (TASS)—The Vorgashorskaya mine, one of the largest in the Pechora coal basin, began coal extraction and delivery to customers at midnight

tonight. The decision to resume work in the Vorgashorskaya collective was made after it received a statute setting out the mine's full economic independence, which was confirmed by Mikhail Shchadov, USSR minister of the coal industry. Repair and preparatory work was being done here yesterday, and coal extraction began overnight.

A TASS correspondent was told at the Vorkutaugol association that all its coal extraction enterprises are working today, but many of them have not yet built up the necessary rage of production following the strike. Thus, the plans for 1 December were not met. In the association as a whole, just over 18,000 fewer tonnes of fuel was brought up on 1 December than plannned. Delivery of fuel to customers has increased, but the planned level has not been reached yet.

'Conflict' Not Over

LD0212180989 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] The Vorkuta coal mining region has been paralyzed by a strike for more than a month. In fact, only one mine continued the strike after the other had resumed work following their representatives' talks with the prime minister, Nikolay Ryzhkov, in the middle of last month. More from our correspondent, (Irina Simenova):

[(Simenova)] The miners went on strike to demand better working and living conditions. Together with the miners in other regions they made their claims to the government after a 1-day strike last summer. The prime minister, Nikolay Ryzhkov, met the miners' representatives on 17 November. Agreement was reached to solve the problems that have piled up in the coal industry as soon as possible. Most Vorkuta miners felt satisfied with the government's decision and stopped their second strike launched on 25 October. Only one mine, Vorgashorskaya, declined to halt the action. It had a package of demands, political ones included. But this mine stopped the strike eventually too. Strike committee member, (Renat Yesupov) explains why:

[Begin (Yesupov) recording in Russian, fading to English translation] Because we were given economic independence, we will leave the Vorkuta Coal Mining Association and will be directly attached to the Coal Ministry. [end recording]

(Renat Yesupov) then explained that economic independence had been their chief economic demand and that they were glad that it had been met. Specialists say that this will undoubtedly be lucrative for us, said (Renat Yesupov).

And yet there is every indication that the conflict between the miners and the government is not over. The miners say the government had met only part of their claims. For one thing they demand benefits for all those who work in the Arctic, rather than for those who are empoloyed in the pits. In their view, one-sided privileges drive a wedge between them and the rest of the working people. However, the cabinet disagrees with this. At a news conference on Wednesday, the deputy prime minister, Lev Ryabev, stressed that after the meeting with Ryzhkov, the government, together with the Trade Union Central Council, examined all the issues raised by the Vorkuta miners and decided to provide the coal miners in Komi, Yakutsk, Khabarovsk, Sakhalin, and Magadan regions with more benefits.

Ryabev Briefs Newsmen on Miners' Demands

PM3011153489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[V. Goncharov report: "Promise Lived Up To"]

[Text] A scheduled meeting with journalists from central newspapers was held in the USSR Council of Ministers on 29 November. They discussed how the government is resolving the problems that have built up in the coal industry, including in the Pechora basin, and what specifically has been done since the 17 November meeting between representatives of mining labor collectives and N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other government members.

L.D. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, said that important decisions have been taken on the results of the 17 November meeting. For example, the Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] have together discussed all the questions raised by the Vorkuta miners. A resolution has been passed on broadening benefits for working people in enterprises and organizations under the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry in the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (ASSR), Yakutsk ASSR, Khabarovsk Kray, Sakhalin Oblast, and Magadan Oblast.

In particular, starting 1 January 1990 for production personnel and 1 January 1991 for all other personnel, when calculating the length of service giving the right to receive an old age pension or disability pension, 1 year of work in the aforementioned regions will be counted as 1 year and 6 months. For miners who leave employment at enterprises and organizations located in regions of the far north and equivalent regions in connection with their move to other areas but then return at a later date, the wage increments for which they qualify will be reduced according to the length of their break in service. In this respect, the reduction will be made on the basis of the same procedure and on the same scale as stipulated in current legislation governing length of service increases. Their service record will remain unbroken if the interval between the day of leaving employment and the day of taking up work in these regions does not exceed the time limit stipulated by current legislation.

The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, USSR State Planning Committee, and USSR Ministry of Finance are instructed to work with the AUCCTU in examining the question of extending these

additional benefits to working people at enterprises and organizations in other sectors of the national economy in these areas and submit the relevant proposals no later than 1 January 1991, to coincide with the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in the period 1991-1995.

Regulations on a state-public commission to monitor implementation of USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 608 have also been approved. Such commissions are being formed at both central and regional levels. They will be made up of leading personnel from the USSR Council of Ministers and union and autonomous republic councils of ministers, territorial trade union committees, and representatives of labor collectives. At oblast level, working groups will operate as bodies of the commission. The commission's powers are very broad. It has the right to check the implementation of government instructions at local level, hear reports by officials responsible for implementing resolution 608, assist in resolving conflicts and disputes arising at local level, draft relevant proposals and submit them to the government, and so forth.

L.D. Ryabev said that the government had asked for 10 days to draw up these documents and had fully complied with this deadline. A group of Vorkuta miners and also representatives of Sakhalin, the Donbass, and Karaganda were involved in drafting the documents.

The approved documents have been sent to the provinces, including all the Vorkuta mines. And the regulations on a state-public commission to monitor implementation of Resolution 608 have been sent to all the mining regions.

Vorkuta Situation, Ryabev Comments Examined

PM0112152189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Feature under the "Direct Line" rubric comprising report from Vorkuta by Viktor Filippov under the headline "'Vorgashorskaya' Communists' Stance..." and report by I. Demchenko under the headline "...And the Government's Stance"]

[Text] Vorkuta—The "Vorgashorskaya" miners have spoken openly and self-critically about responsibility for their actions for the first time in the 36-day strike. On Wednesday, 29 November, the mine's party committee summoned Communists to a meeting. The current situation was on the agenda.

The party committee's stance as set out by its secretary Anatoliy Kiforenko is as follows: Communists lost their heads and informals seized the initiative. Emissaries from all "free trade unions" and "people's fronts" visited the "Vorgashorskaya" strike committee in November. They are striving to use the workers movement to exert pressure on the government. At the strike committee's prompting some miners have already approved a resolution of no-confidence in the government. At this moment every Communist must clearly determine his position.

Mine director Petr Yermakov proposed beginning work as of 0000 1 December. In the remaining month this year the mine could compensate for its losses and enter the new year without shortfalls. This is necessary for the transfer to complete independence. The mine management has concluded a contract with a West European firm to exchange coal with it for commodities for the miners. But there is not a single tonne of coal in store.

"The strike is choking the mine," P. Yermakov said. "Stopping the strike does not mean the loss of face which many people fear. There are other forms of struggle to uphold their interests."

"We are urged to strike to the limit. I went to the strike committee to find out where the limit is," Polda Sheremet, a machine operator at the compressor plant, said at the party meeting. "I was called a 'parasite' there since I work on the surface and thus live off those who extract coal underground. I joined the party committee—they also have no concept of the strike's final aim."

Sergey Kozlov, deputy secretary of the mine's party committee and also deputy chairman of the strike committee, approached the microphone:

"I am also in favor of getting back to work. But when? We reckon that the government is not fulfilling our demands and is deceiving the miners."

"Are you speaking on behalf of the entire strike committee?"

"No, the full strike committee has not met."

"So how long are we to go on striking?"

"Strike until the 12 December and submit demands to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the day it opens..."

In the resolution adopted by the meeting the Communists rejected the strike committee's resolution of no-confidence and raised the task of extricating the mine from the strike by 0000 hours 1 December. And holding new elections for the strike committee.

A secret strike ballot began at the mine 29 November in the evening, on Communists'insistence. It will last 24 hours to ensure that all four shifts of miners can express their opinion. [Filippov ends].

L. Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, informed Soviet journalists 29 November about how Resolution 608 is being fulfilled.

Two of the resolution's 37 points, which the government pledged to fulfill, are at present not being fulfilled. It has not proved possible to organize an uninterrupted supply of freightcars for shipments. In the first 28 days in November the Ministry of Railways failed to provide

miners with 68,500 freightcars. Admittedly, L. Ryabev pointed out straightaway, Ministry of the Coal Industry enterprises failed to use 30,200 of the freightcars they had at their disposal. Thus it is not only railroad workers who are to blame for the poor shipment of coal.

The second point that is not being carried out in full concerns mines' material and technical provisioning. Great shortfalls of construction materials, machines, mechanisms, and other types of resources are continuing. In other words, the positions where our entire national economy is "weakest" of all were the most vulnerable in the Council of Ministers resolution. The remaining points are being carried out in full, as on record, including the decisions adopted on the results of the 17 November meeting between the head of the government and the miners. But, as is well known, the "Vorgashorskaya" collective has not halted its strike. What is the reason for this, in L. Ryabev's opinion?

I think, Lev Dmitriyevich answered, the main reason is that we are looking at the signed documents from a different angle. I know that Resolution 608 "weighs" R4 billion. What was a miner conscious of at his work place 3 months after the agreement was concluded with the government? Top-up payments for evening and night work have been introduced, along with payment for the trip from the top of the mine shaft underground and back. That is virtually all. He will, of course, be conscious of the great changes in pension legislation and leave regulations—but in 1990. The increase in housing construction is to be appreciable—an increase of 15 percent next year and an increase by a factor of 1.5-2 in the next 5-year plan. But once again that is not today. Hence dissatisfaction is arising and various forces have skillfully exploited this.

Miners pin very main hopes on the idea that we have something to give at central level. You simply have to cause a good bit of upheaval and an apple or a piece of pie will fall into your lap. I do not want to say that the miners' demands are unjust. Oh the contrary, they are very just but we are unable to fulfill them immediately. Let me explain why. Some R16 billion were earmarked in the 12th 5-Year Plan for centralized measures to boost the population's standard of living. Let's calculate what our decisions will cost. Some R35 billion, R8-9 billion, and R4 billion respectively will be needed for the pension legislation, the Law on Leave, and the fulfillment of the miners' demands... Yet we still have to solve the question of assistance for war veterans, large impoverished families, and so on.

Well, as we can see, the government has displayed readiness to compromise and has even agreed to revise certain decisions which first denied miners' requests. But we cannot make concessions ad infinitum and, to be honest, there is nothing left to concede. The funds allocated to the miners are being paid from the budget deficit. It must not be increased. Aware of this, the workers of the Donbass, Kuzbass, Karaganda, and other mining regions have stopped striking. It is only the "Vorgashorskaya" mine, which is the best-equipped and has the best working conditions not only in the Pechora coalfield but, perhaps, in the sector, that is continuing to strike.

"Wasn't the question of closing down the mine raised?" I asked L. Ryabev.

No, Lev Dmitriyevich replied. That would mean putting 3,500 people on the street. The government intends to continue displaying goodwill, it intends to meet with the collective's representatives and provide very full information as to how their demands are being met. No penalties are being applied or will be applied against the mine collective or against the members of the strike committee—apart from economic penalties. At the same time we cannot—with the best will in the world—do more than we are doing.

We all still have to analyze the lessons of the mining events. But I think that we can draw one conclusion now. An unprecedented situation arose during the talks. This is the first time that potentially any miner delegated by the collective has been able take a matter to government level. This is first time that the government has been answerable for its pledges directly to the people rather than the Supreme Soviet. This turns out to be much harder.

RSFSR Parliament on Measures on Vorkuta, Railways

PM0112203189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 First Edition p 2

["Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Resolution: RSFSR Government Announcement on Measures To Be Taken in Connection With the Strike in Vorkuta City and the Situation on Certain Railroads in the RSFSR"]

[Text] In view of the tense situation created by the miners' strike in Vorkuta City as well as on certain railroads in the republic, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet **resolves**:

1. To take note of the RSFSR government's announcement of measures to be taken to fulfill the joint decisions of the government commission and the workers' strike committees of the Pechora coal basin as well as to normalize the situation on certain railroads in the RSFSR in connection with the worsening of the situation on the Azerbaijan Railroad.

2. To instruct the Council of Ministers to step up the monitoring of the fulfillment of USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 608 of 3 August 1989 and RSFSR Council of Ministers Resolution 254 of 15 August 1989 with a view to achieving the earliest resolution of the labor conflict in the Pechora coal basin.

3. To instruct the RSFSR Council of Ministers to examine and take effective measures to eliminate the serious shortcomings in the work of rail transport enterprises on the territory of the RSFSR caused by the

worsening of the situation on the Azerbaijan Railroad. And to submit proposals to the USSR Council of Ministers on questions requiring solution by union organs.

4. To approve the text of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Appeal to the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] V. Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
S. Chistoplyasov, secretary of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
Moscow, Kremlin, 29 November 1989.

Miners' Living Conditions Described

904E0023B Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Nov 89 p 2

[Second of two installments of the article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondent Ye. Losoto: "Vorkuta—Coal"]

[Text] Next day, we went to see how the miners live.

There were decrepit homes dating back to the time of prison camps and huts about which ranking officials visiting Vorkuta say: "In 2 years, there has got to be none of that here!" The huts stand there nonetheless, and they are not being depreciated. All the conveniences are outdoors, the water comes from a communal tap, the walls are moist, a septic tank is under the house, and you can smell it.

Certainly, not all of Vorkuta is like that but most of the housing stock is exactly like that. There is even a camouflaged settlement marked on the map as "the industrial zone." It is virtually unrealistic to receive a regular apartment; you have to be on the waiting list for 15 to 20 years, that is, go over the line beyond which a miner should stop not only working but also living above the Arctic Circle.

Here are my short notes.

Trudovaya Street 11, apartment 2. A single-story state-owned house. Igor Bilchevskiy has been working at the Severnaya mine for 6 years. This house is built on the swamp, all of it "from head to toe" is in dangerously poor repair. They are trying to repair it but it is no use. There are rats in the house. Igor has sent his family to his parents for the winter because keeping the children over the winter here is risky.

The house is 12 years old, so why is it in this condition?

"Slipshod construction. They should have done the filling rather than reported the meters built."

That is to say, the house should not have been built right on the swamp but, putting it in conventional terms, a foundation should have been laid.

Trudovaya Street 11, apartment 4. Viktor Nikolayevich Volkov, a drifter at the Yun-Yaga mine, the very Yaga which we visited yesterday. He has been here since 1981. As soon as he got married he moved here with his wife, not for money but for independence. Now they have two children.

What has he earned here? Virtually nothing, except for the car. At present, there are 600 rubles in the bank account. After all, taking a vacation together with the family costs 3,000. Everybody here has the same goal: to make enough money for the leave in order to take the children away for the summer! They cannot but take them away! Physicians say that children will lose their health if they are kept here over the summer.

Are the miners rich? It is a problem to borrow 1,000 rubles from someone. A majority have 2,500 to 3,000 rubles in savings accounts, and zero when they come back from their leave. Earnings are around 800 rubles; however, expenditures are as high as incomes. This money is spent for the most urgent needs of the family.

We drank coffee at his place. "How much did you pay for it?" I asked. "Speculators are selling it at 13 to 15 rubles." The state price for this jar is 6 rubles.

The miners do not mind paying for expensive clothing, carpets, wall units (of course, if they are successful in arranging for an allocation voucher). Recently, one fur coat for a child was allocated at the mine per 150 persons, and they drew lots.

This is how it turns out: If the head of the household is still capable of hacking it he provides a regular standard of existence for his household under horrible climatic and housing conditions without any prospects for improvement.

Trudovaya Street 12, a hut. The Timshin family with two children.

"We left Dubna because we could not get by on the salaries there. Here you can do it."

In Dubna, she (a civil engineer) earned 130 rubles, and he (an electrician fitter) 180 rubles. Here he works as a miner making 600, and she makes 300 rubles. They spend all of this money; they have not saved anything. In Dubna, buying a coat was a big problem whereas with their local salaries they can at least buy food and clothes. As of now, they do not intend to go back.

I cannot bring myself to describe conditions in the hut because a family named by their surname lives here rather than fictional characters. They do not invite anyone to their place; "you cannot invite people here."

Enough? Perhaps, it is enough. One final stroke for this chapter: A miner told me that he went above the Arctic Circle because in central Russia he only had one pair of pants, and these were torn.

The issues of Vorkuta represent in a concentrated form the issues of our entire country. This is exactly why they are insoluble for now, and this is what they needed to tell

the miners frankly. The panicky recognition of all their demands as fair entails the obligation to radically improve their situation which is impossible given the deteriorating situation in our entire country. Are their demands justified? Certainly. Can their life be radically changed for the better? Some small things may be accomplished. For example, more money can be printed. The northern coefficient may be increased by the same method. Life cannot be radically improved right now, all at once. How can this be told to the miners in all honesty?

Now they are going to fight for what they have been promised. However, for now it is impossible to keep all the promises.

They have a ton of coal dust per person a year here, and the snow is black. Novaya Zemlya is nearby. The residents of Vorkuta say: As soon as there is a communique that there has been an explosion there, it gets warmer here. Now tell me whether it is possible "to take measures aimed at improving the ecological situation?"

And how can "deliveries of goods made of natural fur be ensured in sufficient quantities and variety?"

"Go to a shop here, enjoy the splendor of it!"

I went there, and enjoyed the splendor of it. Melons were the first thing which caught my eye. They are brought here by cooperative members, but are affordable nonetheless: A small melon goes for 1.4 rubles, and a larger one is about 4 rubles. There were lamb, ducks, cheese, butter, but no sausage. There were vermicelli, noodles, peas, and canned food. I was figuring out what could be cooked and with which ingredients.

They asked me sarcastically: "Well, what do you think?"

"It is all right," I said.

My escorts shrugged their shoulders.

When I came home I went to the nearest self-service store in Moscow. There were no melons but there were puny apples, the same lamb, the same ducks, the same one kind of cheese, but also one kind of sausage, and the same butter. Vermicelli, noodles, and peas were not available (vermicelli was for sale one day later). Canned food was available. This is a well-to-do shop for you; there are no railway stations in the vicinity.

In Moscow as well things were better 5 or 10 years ago. Even a year ago things were better. Before our very eyes, everything from the shelves is vanishing into the thin air.

I went to a Vorkuta general merchandise store. I bought certain things. Nothing remarkable, but there still were checked notebooks, among other things. I am undertaking this description of the daily round so that the country would understand the miners, and the miners would understand the country. Otherwise, it does not turn out right. One newspaper, having believed the promises of the authorities to improve the provisioning of miners has published a cartoon: A muscular miner pushes a truck full of foodstuffs taken away from other regions. He who is audacious gets the prize—this is more or less what the message is.

Meanwhile, the miners are agonizingly offended...

This is from the newspaper ZAPOLYARYE of 12 October of this year. A member of the city strike committee S. Ivanov wrote: "We in the strike committee are already fed up with rumors and slander about us, and have long stopped paying attention to them. Meanwhile, when at the plenum of the central committee of the trade union of coal industry workers regions began to refer to each other it turned out that supplies had not improved in any mining region."

My friends, it is just that supplies are nowhere to be found! Nowhere. Try to provide them! Forget about veal and partridge; even three little trucks running to Khalmer-Yu (this is a remote mine) were sought all over in order to replace the ones which were unfit to carry cattle, to say nothing of people. They looked for the trucks under the threat of a strike at Khalmer-Yu, and they came up with them! They were as happy as a resident of Vorkuta who manages to buy a chunk of boiled sausage or a Muscovite who gets checked notebooks. The pattern is the same in these cases: My "passive attitude toward provisioning" is not the reason why my son does not have checked notebooks.

The following is from the newspaper ZAPOLYARYE of 11 October of this year. Monthly rations of foodstuffs for sick children: 1.5 kilograms of meat or chicken, 0.5 kilograms of buckwheat, 0.5 kilograms of cheese, 2 kilograms of apples, and the note about other foodstuffs says "if available," so it does not make sense to enumerate them.

The Vorkuta strike committee carries out surprise inspections at shops and warehouses, apprehends vodka speculators, and fights the use of connections in the distribution of the goods in short supply. They have found out that imported furniture had been distributed among the management types. They try to determine where the 72 kilograms of caviar allocated to Vorkuta annually go. Thus far, they have not found it. They fight for the construction of housing in other cities for the residents of Vorkuta to begin.

This is how they call themselves: "Counterbalance to the administrative-management apparatus."

By all signs, they are still inexperienced but, as they put it in our country, "serious" people. This is indeed so. They try to reveal injustice in all kinds of activities. Sometimes, it is this kind of injustice: For example, the list of positions and corresponding salaries and bonuses of the management on the one hand and the pay grades of underground workers and their bonuses on the other. Among the entire "top echelon" of the Vorkutaugol

Association, only a secretary-typist makes approximately as much as a category 5 drifter. They gave this list to me, and it is glaring.

Quite a few of the claims of miners are not justified. For example, on 13 October the newspaper ZAPOLYARYE printed a letter by two miners written on behalf of the labor collective of the Khalmer-Yu mine. Among other things, the letter said: "Why did the representatives of the strike committee travel nowhere else but to the Kremlin at the time the strike storm gathered thus going over the head of the local organs of power?.. This issue was of no concern to anybody among the local authorities because they had more important business to attend to—dealing out the goods in short supply..."

Clearly, this is an exaggeration. I had a conversation about their reaction to the events at the city committee of the party. Diametrically opposite opinions collided there. It is offensive and unfair to say that they were busy "dealing out the goods in short supply" in there.

To be sure, a particular reader is entitled to his opinion erroneous as it may be but it is the responsibility of the newspaper to maintain a civilized standard of the argument.

You would agree that the city committee also has to behave decently. At one of the plenums of the city committee, it was suggested that a critically minded and critically writing journalist be either shipped away to a loony bin or expelled from the party.

"Our fame will settle this; after all, all of us belong together..."

Now for the thing which is the hardest for me to write about. The position of the strike committee on the main issue is:

"Even if Resolution No 608 had been fulfilled the issue of strikes still would not have been resolved. This is what the issue is: Labor collectives should themselves control the money they make. Thus far, we have been giving everything to the top receiving handouts from them. Ministries ought to be eliminated altogether, and there ought to be regional economic accountability, first in Vorkuta and subsequently in the Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. Otherwise, we will sit here under a hole in the roof as we have before. The miners are the most organized force which can begin to implement perestroyka. We've had 4.5 years of perestroyka, but it is not in evidence."

The complaints are understandable. However, I still cannot become enthusiastic about the concept of independence for every labor collective. I suspect that the implementation of this concept under our conditions will entail a decline in output, uncontrollable price increases, and the ultimate collapse of the national economy. This is merely a suspicion; however, I believe that concealing it is not warranted.

At present, the strike committee enjoys tremendous confidence of the people. It is not to official organizations but to the strike committee that people go for help in the matters of housing and supplies. They go there for social justice. The strike committee is financed by miners; the average age of representatives on it is 30.

There is a party cell of its own in the strike committee.

The discipline there is strict, and the confidence in the strike center in Moscow is complete.

What if there is a provocation or somebody's ambitions? There is no insurance against this. They will go on strike, and they will take no heed of the law. They will heed their own center. A strike alert was in effect when I left...

I came to Moscow and turned on the radio: There was a strike in Vorkuta. For the first time in our history, the management took the strike committee to court. Therefore, the standoff would intensify still further. Let us not forget about the peculiarities of the region. What does the coming day have in store for us?

I will repeat again and again: All problems of the miners are a reflection of the problems of the country in a concentrated form—construction in Vorkuta itself, improvement in conditions on the job, provisioning, reductions in the duration of the difficult work of miners, and everything else down to trifles. Solving these problems constitutes a program for decades rather than until 1 January 1990.

You can no better run away from your country than you can run away from yourself. Poverty is the same in central Russia and in the north but the look of it is different. This great country ought to be improved in its entirety rather than have people saving their own hide by putting pressure on those who would be glad to deliver but are not in a position to. This makes no sense.

No government resolution will change the state of affairs radically, be its No 608 or 600,000,000. We have to realize that we are being sucked into a vortex. In that sense, every strike, and especially in basic industries, speeds up the movement.

At present, many people attach hopes to the workers' movement, myself included. However, this movement has got to be flexible and responsible so as not to have our boat capsize altogether as it rises.

When the issue was being typeset we received a report from our correspondent V. Pantsyrev.

"The situation in Vorkuta has become critical. I am convinced that you do not wish the worst for the miners, for the entire industry, or our country. This is why I am asking you to at least restore yesterday's status when the Vorshagorskaya mine alone was on strike"—this is how USSR Deputy Minister of the Coal Industry A.K. Belikov finished his speech at a conference of the mine strike committees and the city workers' committee yesterday. However, the conference made another decision:

to continue the strike which an overwhelming majority of the mines of Vorkuta have joined over the past 24 hours.

Armenian Party Central Committee Meets

NC0112190889 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Yerevan, 1 December, ARMENPRES—The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee met on 29 November and was attended by Suren Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, who briefed the participants in detail on the outcome of the USSR Supreme Soviet where steps to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] were discussed.

The particpants voiced support for the decision by the Presidium of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet to continue its session on 30 November 1989 and to study reports on the outcomes of the USSR Supreme Soviet's deliberations on steps concerning the NKAO.

Further on Armenian, NKAO Joint Session

NC0212083389 Yerevan International Service in Armenian
1630 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] The joint session of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet and the representatives of the National Council of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] is continuing its deliberations today. It reconvened yesterday under conditions without precedent in the history of the NKAO and Armenia. The agenda of the session includes all fundamental problems facing our people.

The deputies and the representatives of the NKAO National Council yesterday examined the report on the USSR Supreme Soviet decision on measures to normalize the situation in the NKAO. Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, delivered a report on the issue.

We want to remind our listeners that the NKAO and Armenian deputies neither took part in the formulation of the draft of that decision nor in the vote over it. Those who drew up the draft saw no need to take the Armenian deputies' views and suggestions into consideration. There was virtually no debate on the draft resolution at the session. Instead, the deputies, after hearing a hurried reading of it, voted mechanically to endorse it. The fact is that this sad issue for the Soviet Union was only raised on the last day of the 2-month-long Supreme Soviet session, when the deputies from the various republics were tired and eager to return home.

The joint session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the representatives of the NKAO National Council categorically rejected this decision, considering it to be in violation of the interests and all legal rights of the Artsakh [NKAO] people and the entire Armenian people. The effective unification of Artsakh and Armenia was registered. [Ardzanagrvets Artsakhi yev Hayastani pastakan miavorumi]

The session also condemned the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry's statement concerning the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee's draft resolution on the NKAO, a statement which was also made without taking the views of the Armenian people into consideration.

The participants in the session will also discuss issues related to the 16 March 1921 Russo-Turkish treaty made at the expense of the Armenian people, the 5 July 1921 decision of the party's Caucasian Bureau on the NKAO, and the revision of Armenia's obligations toward the union.

The deputies also plan an in-depth discussion on the resettlement, provision of work, and the organization of the daily life of the Armenian population forcefully uprooted from Azerbaijan, the measures to ensure security for the Armenian population in Armenian regions bordering on Azerbaijan, and other problems.

The session today adopted a decision concerning the blockade of Armenia and Artsakh. As you already know, because of the inactivity of the central authorities of the Soviet Union, this act undertaken by Azerbaijan has caused damages amounting to billions to the economy of the NKAO and Armenia and has undermined restoration work in the disaster zone.

Dear compatriots, we will be informing you about the progress of the session and its decisions in later broadcasts.

Armenia Votes for Unity With NKAO

LD0212130189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1200 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] The extraordinary session of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet finished its work unusually, as far as the time is concerned: after midnight. This is explained by the complexity of the issues on the agenda. The main one was discussion of the USSR Supreme Soviet decision on measures to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], a report on which was delivered by Voskanyan, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium.

A broad dialogue took place on the need to stabilise the situation in and around Nagorno-Karabakh. Alarm was expressed in connection with the resumed interruptions in rail transportation and the unfounded delaying of freight going to Armenia and the autonomous oblast. The people's deputies set out their point of view on the document adopted concerning NKAO.

The session unanimously adopted a decision by the republic's Supreme Soviet on the reunification of the Armenian SSR and Nagorno-Karabakh. The session also adopted a decision on the statement by the USSR

Foreign Ministry in connection with the resolution by the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate on Nagorno-Karabakh. The question of additional measures to step up work on providing facilities for refugees arriving from Azerbaijan was examined.

Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, participated in the session.

United Armenian Republic Proclaimed

NC0112190289 Paris AFP in English 1856 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec 1 (AFP)—Two Soviet republics Friday defied Moscow with Armenia dropping its Soviet Socialist appellation and proclaiming itself united with a neighboring contested Armenian enclave and Lithuania moving to distance itself from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In the southern republic of Armenia, the local Supreme Soviet, or parliament, held a special joint session with representatives of the ethnic Armenian community from Nagorno-Karabakh, an autonomous enclave inside Azerbaijan, to proclaim a "United Armenian Republic" regrouping both territories, local nationalist sources said.

And in the Baltic republic of Lithuania, a full meeting of the local communist party's central committee called on a forthcoming congress to consider freeing the local party from central control, local nationalists said.

The moves, from two of the most fiercely nationalist Soviet republics, came while President Mikhail Gorbachev was out of the country, preparing to meet with U.S. President George Bush in Malta.

In the Caucasus, Armenian assembly representatives used the federal parliament's recent attempt to hammer out a compromise over Nagorno-Karabakh as an excuse to proclaim unilaterally their own solution to the long-festering dispute with Azerbaijan.

Nagorno-Karabakh, inhabited mostly by ethnic Armenians, is an autonomous region but falls under the jurisdiction of the Azerbaijan republic.

The Armenian parliament, along with representatives from Nagorno-Karabakh's Armenian National Movement, unanimously voted for a united republic and the extension of Armenian citizenship rights to ethnic Armenians in Azerbaijan, according to Levon Khachaturyan, a national leader.

Those voting for the resolution included party First Secretary Suren Arutyunyan and President Grant Voskanyan, he added.

The resolution will likely be declared unconstitutional by Moscow.

Meanwhile in Vilnius, Lithuania's capital, the local communist party plenum ignored an appeal by Mr. Gorbachev, read out by fellow Politburo member Vadim Medvedev, against splitting the party, according to Lionginas Vasiliauskas, a spokesman for the nationalist Sajudis movement.

Mr. Medvedev, the Politburo member responsible for ideology, had made the trip specially to Vilnius along with party secretary Nikolay Slyunkov and Central Committee member Vladimir Mikhailov to talk Lithuanian Communists out of setting up an autonomous communist party at their mid-December congress.

Mr. Gorbachev, who had earlier spoken out against any "federalisation" of the party organisation, reportedly warned in his message that a split in the party would threaten the future of his policy for reform known as perestroyka.

"It is a shame that you should want to leave at a time which is so difficult for us," Mr. Medvedev reportedly told the plenum meeting.

"It is a question of principle," Lithuanian first party secretary Algirdas Brazauskas reportedly answered, according to sources who followed the plenum live on local radio.

More on Armenian 'United Republic'

NC0212065889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] The joint session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the National Council of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] resumed its deliberations yesterday at Stepan Shaumyan Hall. The session was opened on 30 November by Deputy Miro Mstoyan, deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

The session debated the course of the implementation of the 17 September 1989 decision of the Armenian Supreme Soviet on urgent measures to eliminate the tension in the region and the blockade of Armenia and the NKAO. Yuriy Khodzhamiryan, deputy chairman of the republic's council of ministers, delivered a report on this issue which was followed by an exchange of views.

Deputy Levon Ter-Petrosyan then presented the draft decision concerning the appeal of the NKAO National Council, which was unanimously adopted after additions and corrections were made. In connection with the statement made by Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, the joint session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council adopted a resolution on creating a united republic and rejecting the 28 November decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Decisions were also adopted on other issues under debate.

Supreme Soviet NKAO Decision Said 'Unjust'

NC0112191589 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Report by ARMENPRES correspondent A. Grigoryan]

[Text] Stepanakert, 1 December, ARMENPRES—The Armenians of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] received with concern the news of the USSR Supreme Soviet's decision on steps to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. The morning after the decision, Stepanakert residents started to gather in groups in various corners of the city and heatedly discussed the approved decision which is directly linked to the future of the city's residents. All of them unanimously stated that not only does the decision not meet the interests of the Artsakh Armenians, but it also threatens their very existence.

"No Karabakhian could have expected such a biased decision," Leonard Petrosyan, head of the NKAO Agroindustry told the ARMENPRES correspondent. "It seems that this decision too will remain on paper because our people will not accept it. The central authorities have actually once again chosen to postpone a just solution to the NKAO problem and have portrayed the NKAO Armenians' legal demands in a different light. And it is surprising and doubtful how the Azerbaijani government, which until now so stubbornly (?rejected) the central authorities and did not allow anything to be said about the blockade of Armenia and of the NKAO, is now forced to lift the blockade. As for Artsakh, one can say that it has been under seige for 70 years, and unfortunately the center does not attach any political significance to this. I, as a deputy of the oblast's soviet, do not consider the revival of the oblast's government bodies possible. I repeat that this decision will remain on paper, of course if it is not decided that it will be implemented by methods that were used in the 1930's. The question is: Was it necessary to wait more than a year and a half to adopt such a decision?"

"Yesterday's decision is [word indistinct]," said Sedrak Sedrakyan, head of economic planning and candidate of economic sciences. "The very fact that the document was approved after the Armenian and NKAO deputies left the hall in protest is an insult to the Armenian people. I think that the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council should adopt a decisive stand on the issue and inform the world. I do not believe that self-rule and self-financing will be achieved in the oblast since these beautiful words lose their meaning when they do not consider the main issue: the people's self-determination. One cannot build a house without laying a foundation, and the new decision, which is tantamount to building lacking a sound base, is an extremely wrong attempt."

Rallies took place in the oblast's labor collectives, cities, and rayons today, 29 November. The orators spoke heatedly about the unjust decision on the NKAO and pointed out that that decision by the country's Supreme Soviet can be clearly described as capitulation and that its contents actually coincide with the demands made by the Azerbaijan Popular Front. It is ridiculous that the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR—the very republic which created "Sumgait"—has been assigned the task of guaranteeing the security of the Armenians of the NKAO. But despite all these arbitrary decisions, Artsakh has made its choice once and for all; and, as stressed in the speeches at the rally, it will continue to live and to struggle in order to achieve its just and noble objective.

Resolution ' Another Insult'

NC0112141989 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Text] Although the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on measures to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has been signed by Gorbachev, the signature could as well have belonged to Vezirov and it would have been more appropriate to the spirit and aims of the decision. Another impression one can draw from this infamous document is that the decision has been taken not to solve the vital problems of the Artsakh [NKAO] people, but primarily to mislead international public opinion. It is a decision addressed to George Bush. It aims to allay the concerns of the U.S. President and to mislead him.

As the academician Andrey Sakharov put it, the long-suffering people of Artsakh [NKAO] [word indistinct] was not expecting a pro-Azerbaijani decision and measures, but a just solution to the problem and the recognition of the right of self-determination for the Armenian population of the oblast and their reunification with the mother people.

The USSR Supreme Soviet decision on the NKAO created a wave of indignation in Shirak region [northwestern Armenia near Leninakan city]. The crude rejection of this just demand by the Armenian people is seen by the workers of Artik as yet another insult by the higher authorities of the country. All of us knew and were convinced that the USSR Supreme Soviet was not going to adopt a favorable decision, but what was unexpected was the possibility that the commission made up of noble, in quotes, deputies could have cooperated with the so-called Azerbaijan National Front and execute its will. This is the opinion of the people of Artik.

Aleksan Urvanyan, chairman of the Vanik collective farm, said: All my conscious life has been dedicated to our country and party. my friends and I fought on a different war front and were convinced at the time that by shedding our blood we were protecting the interests of the peoples of a multinational country. However, it now transpires that we have also protected the interests of our enemies thirsty for our blood. We are convinced that the healthy forces in the country have not [word indistinct] and which will help justice triumph.

Representatives of the party organizations, labour collectives and people's deputies of the 26-Commissars Rayon of Yerevan recently held a meeting. They discussed the USSR Supreme Soviet decision concerning the NKAO. They expressed their disagreement with the decision and decided on the following: Considering the fact that the 28 November USSR Supreme Soviet decision on measures to normalize the situation in NKAO turns a just solution for the NKAO problem into an impasse, that it violates the interests of the Armenian people which make up 80 percent of the oblast, that it will further aggravate the situation in the region, and the fact that the decision has been endorsed without considering the protest of the USSR peoples deputies from NKAO and Armenia, the meeting resolves to condemn the decision of the Supreme Soviet and declare it unacceptable.

The meeting called on all the workers of the republic and on all Armenians in internal and external diaspora to unite and under present conditions consider any dissension among Armenian forces as a treason against the nation. All efforts must be united to assist the motherland, which has suffered from the enormous earthquake and faces a complex political situation.

Yerevan Paper on Decision

NC0112141589 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Text] Our patient people of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and Armenia had certain expectations about the final session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in view of the fact that it had dispatched a commission to NKAO. The members of the commission again listened to the local Armenian people and became convinced that their demands are justified and well-founded, writes KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN newspaper today. The NKAO people too were convinced that their just demands would be taken into account in the country's parliament.

However, the hurried debate in the USSR Supreme Soviet on the last day and the agreed decision bearing the signature of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet presidium again disillusioned our people. It is difficult to use a term to describe such an action by a country which has signed an international treaty recognizing the principle of free self-determination of the nations and which accepts the Leninist principle of national self-determination.

The Armenian people will never be disheartened. They will continue to struggle until justice triumphs. Artsakh [NKAO] must unite with its real mother, Soviet Armenia, the newspaper concludes.

Tarazevich Discusses NKAO Decision

LD0212222189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Interview with Georgiy Tarazevich, chairman of the Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet on nationalities policy and interethnic relations, by unidentified reporter; date not given; from the "Our Interviews" program within the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Reporter] Georgiy Stanislavovich, the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on measures for normalization of the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast has been released. Will you please comment?

[Tarazevich] The idea of the decision is, first, to reduce the role and presense of the center. As is known, in January of this year, when the conflict was growing, a committee for special administration, headed by Comrade Volskiy, was formed by decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. At the same time the activities of the Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies and Oblast Executive Committee were suspended. Thus, the Committee of Special Administration was taking upon itself not only the functions of maintaining order and prevention of conflict situations, not just of somehow standing between the conflicting sides, and to stand, so to speak, with the presence of force, as the internal troops were there. But managing functions were laid on the Committee of Special Administration as well—in fact, to manage the entire national economy of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. And when on 20 October of this year this issue was considered at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, an idea was expressed.

I have the decision of the Presidium in front of me. I will read an excerpt. It was noted by the Presidium that a solution of the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh was possible only on the basis of political dialogue and accord between representatives of the Azerbaijani and Armenian population. That is why, in this decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on which you asked me to comment, the decision has been adopted to consider that the Committee of Special Administration has exhausted its functions and, in fact, should suspend its activities.

[Reporter] But, Georgiy Stanislavovich, in this very decision it is written: To replace this committee, to form an all-union monitoring and observation commission.

[Tarazevich] Absolutely true. But the presence of the center is preserved. Indeed, the presence of the center is preserved in the form of an all-union monitoring and observation commission. What are the functions of this commission? First of all, this commission will not deal with the issues of managing social and economic processes. These issues will be dealt with by the newly reinstated local soviet bodies, and this commission will

observe; it will be like an outside arbitrator. It will observe the development of the processes that take place in Nagorno-Karabakh.

If situations arise in which intervention is necessary to, let us say, prevent some conflict...[changes thought] besides this, as regards managing socioeconomic processes and creating normal living conditions for the people of Karabakh, there is yet another idea contained in this decision—that of increasing, or enhancing, the status of the autonomous oblast as a self-governing autonomous formation, of enhancing its very independence in all matters, including economic matters, in matters of social development, and in matters concerning the management of other processes arising in the oblast's public life. For this reason, the decision calls for the promulgation within 2 months of a special law to define the status of NKAO and to guarantee Nagorno-Karabakh fully fledged development in all spheres of state, economic and cultural construction on the basis of self-administration, self-financing, territorial financial autonomy, and freedom of economic and cultural ties. Life itself really does demand an enhancement of the autonomous oblast's status.

[Reporter] Georgiy Stanislavovich, what then would you say about the fact that before the decision has even been published, reaction to it is, let us say, mixed?

[Tarazevich] Yes, you are right. There has been a mixed reaction to the decision. First, the matter is such a serious one, such a poignant one, that any broaching of it—especially by a major body like the Supreme Soviet, by a decision of the Supreme Soviet—naturally leaves nobody indifferent, both in one republic, or let us say, both in the republics and the autonomous oblast. The reaction was therefore a very rapid one, a sharp reaction. But the mixed nature of the approaches to the decision can probably also be explained by the fact that it is very laconic and requires probably some additional or broader elucidation. I hope that such elucidation will appear in the press.

On Normalizing Situation

LD0212051289 Moscow TASS in English 2333 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—The idea underlying the recent USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on the normalisation of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh aims, above all, to reduce the centre's role and presence in the region, said Georgiy Tarazevich, chairman of the Council of Nationalities chamber's Commission for Nationality Policy and Inter-ethnic Relations.

He was speaking in an interview with Soviet Television televised in the night Vremya news programme.

Tarazevich recalled that a special administrative committee was established in January this year. At that time the activity of the regional soviet of people's deputies and its executive committee was suspended.

In that way, the special administrative committee had to shoulder not only the responsibility for maintaining law and order and averting the outbreak of violence in the region but also other government functions.

The committee has by now exhausted its potential and is suspending its activity, according to Tarazevich.

However, the presence of the centre will persist represented by the federal verification and monitoring commission. It will arbiter the processes under way in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Tarazevich pointed out that the resolution provided for the adoption, within two months, of a special law to determine the region's status and guarantee its equitable development in all areas of state, economic and cultural construction on the basis of self-government, self-financing and freedom of economic and cultural relations.

Rail Blockade of Armenia Enters 5th Day

NC0212133889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] The railway blockade of the Armenian Republic has entered its fifth day. No trains entered Armenia through the Norashen and Idzhevan stations on 30 November. The efforts of officials of the Yerevan branch of the Transcaucasian railways to establish contacts with the Azerbaijani side have had no results. On 30 November, 7 trains with a total of 180 freight cars arrived from Georgia. Fourteen trains with a total of 450 freight cars left Armenia via the Transcaucasian railways with goods for various parts of the country. A total of 1,055 freight cars were unloaded at the republic's station in one day. Overall, 488 freight cars have been unloaded in the disaster zone; 192 cars remain unloaded.

Because of the unsatisfactory work by the Moscow [word indistinct] design and construction association, the Armenian construction [word indistinct], the Leningrad construction association, and other associations involved, the pace of car unloading has slackened despite the fact that fewer trains are arriving because of the blockade.

Committee Meets To Assess Costs

NC0212155589 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 29 Nov 89

[Text] Yerevan, 29 Nov (ARMENPRES)—The government commission to assess the material damage caused by the blockade of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic and by irresponsible people held its regular meeting.

It was chaired by M. Mkrtchyan, chairman of the commission, deputy chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee. The commission discussed the amount of

damage to Armenia's national economy during the third quarter of 1989 because of the blockade.

The figures presented by the republican ministries and administrative boards as well as by the enterprises and organizations under union jurisdiction, show the direct damage from the blockade of Armenian's transportation routes by Azerbaijan amounted to R229 million. R32.8 million of that sum was used for wages to the enforced unemployed, and R42.1 as penalty for production lags.

The indirect damage caused to Armenian national economy during the third quarter of 1989 alone amounted to R1.38 billion.

The Armenian Council of Ministers sent the documents concerning the damage to the republic's national economy during the third quarter of the 1989 to the USSR procuracy and to the Armenian procuracy, requesting the institution of criminal proceedings to make the culprits take responsibility and to ask for compensation.

Armenian Publication Says Dissidents Jailed

NC0212151589 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 23 Nov 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Two issues of the newspaper of the Yerevan Polytechnic Institute were devoted to exposing the truth about the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. These issues were sent to all the higher institutes of the country.

Now, that newspaper has devoted one of its issues to the truth about the NKAO developments. It has sent issues to the different corners of the union. The issue evaluates the Vezirov version of internationalism and those acts that are instigated by the Azerbaijan leadership. Many items in the paper elaborate in detail the historical and just nature of the NKAO problem and the barbaric and instigatory acts committed by the neighboring republic on the regions bordering Armenia and Artsakh [NKAO]. It also provides numerous proofs of mass killings and torture of Armenians in Azerbaijan.

It also published an open letter from the Armenian committee on human rights in support of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Deputy Arkadiy Manucharov, who is probably being detained in the (?Mudilyan) Prison in Moscow.

The reader is also informed that for similar groundless reasons, Zinayida Muderetsova is being kept in solitary confinement. She is one of the witnesses to the Sumgait genocide and dared to tell the public the truth.

The paper also published figures on the number of Armenian victims in Ottoman Turkey between 1895 to 1920. It published a historic map of Armenia and a number of impressive pictures.

Earthquake Anniversary To Be Marked 7 Dec

NC2511110889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] In line with the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian republic that declares 7 December 1989 as the day of commemoration of the victims of the earthquake, the Armenian Council of Ministers has decided to declare 7 December 1989 a holiday. The work day has been shifted to Saturday, 9 December.

Measures for Azerbaijan Railway Workers Examined

NC2411115589 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 22 Nov 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers, and the USSR Ministry of Railways have examined the immediate measures that must be taken to develop the Nakhichevan department of the Azerbaijan SSR railways network and improve the political training of the Nakhichevan railways collective. The decision that was adopted has been published in today's newspapers.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, and the USSR Ministry of Railways have expressed their confidence that the communists and all workers who are employed on the tracks will act with political maturity, remember their responsibility, display a sense of [word indistinct] and organization, and channel all their efforts toward securing the flawless and uninterrupted transportation of goods.

RSFSR Prepares for Congressional Elections

LD0112134289 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, November 30 (TASS)—By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov: The Russian Federation, the largest republic of the Soviet Union, is making preparations for elections to the Congress of People's Deputies. The elections will be held on March 4. Nomination of candidates will start on December 4.

"This is the most responsible period of the election campaign," Vasiliy Kazakov, chairman of the Central Elections Commission, told TASS. "The success of the entire campaign depends on it.

"The brunt of the work will be borne by district election commissions. Together with working collectives and public organisations they are to create proper conditions for the nomination of people able to uphold the interests of their electors and capable of combining these interests with those of society as a whole. All the meetings and other events should be held in conditions of Glasnost. This is very important.

"The principal task of the Central Elections Commission today is to render effective assistance to district commissions and to ensure scrupulous observance of the elections law. We have, of course, taken stock of the recent elections of people's deputies of the USSR."

Millions of voters will for the first time elect this spring the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, which, in turn, will form a permanently working parliament. It will consist of two equal chambers—the Council of the Republic and the Council of Nationalities. As many as 900 territorial and 168 national-territorial constituencies have been formed in the Russian Federation.

Candidate Nominations Begin

LD0412094189 Moscow TASS in English 0812 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Lev Aksyonov:

The nomination of candidates for elections scheduled for March 4, 1990 begins in the Russian Federation, the largest Soviet Union Republic, today.

People are to determine who will contend for the posts of deputies in 1,068 electoral districts throughout the republic's vast territory which stretches for ten time zones from East to West.

The election of people's deputies in the Russian Federation will for the first time be held according to a new system which was decided upon by the republican parliament recently.

A Congress of Peoples Deputies, consisting of 1,068 people, will now become the republic's supreme power body. They will form from among themselves a permanently functioning Supreme Soviet of the Republic.

The second new major element in the functioning of the future republican parliament is that the Russian Federation is a unique state entity as regards ethnic composition. Many tens of nationalities live in the republic.

In order to ensure full equality of all peoples—large and small—it will consist of a council of the republic and a council of nationalities. A total of 900 territorial and 168 national territorial electoral districts have already been formed in the Russian Federation.

The procedure for the nomination of candidates has undergone perhaps the most significant changes. Whereas previously only one candidate remained in each electoral district by the polling date, now their number is unlimited.

So, within the framework of the republic, the notion of "election struggle" will for the first time actually mean just that, with all contenders enjoying absolutely equal rights.

The central and district electoral commissions, comprised of people representing all sections of the population, the personnel of industrial enterprises, scientific institutions, public organisations, servicemen, legal scholars, and the clergy, have begun work.

"The current period is the most important one," Vasiliy Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, told tass. "The success of the entire campaign in many respects depends on the outcome of the current phase.

"District commissions now bear the brunt of the work. Together with work collectives and public organisations they are to create all conditions to ensure that people who realy represent the interst of constituents and who are able to link these interests with the aspirations of the entire people and society as a whole are nominated.

"It is also very important, naturally, that all meetings and other election activities be held in an atmosphere of openness," Kazakov emphasised.

RSFSR Parliament Session Information Report

PM0112111689 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report on Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet Sittings"]

[Text] The 12th RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session continued its work on 29 November 1989. The third sitting opened in the Great Kremlin Palace at 1000 hours.

Comrades V.I. Vorotnikov, A.P. Biryukova, A.V. Vlasov, G.P. Razumovskiy, Yu.A. Manayenkov, Ye.S. Stroyev, and G.I. Usmanov took part in the sitting.

Deputy Ye.A. Norka, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, chaired the sitting.

The discussion continued of the reports and subsidiary reports on the first two items on the session's agenda—the drafts of the State Plan for Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR for 1990 and the Russian Federation State Budget for 1990 and the implementation of the RSFSR State Budget in 1988. The following deputies spoke in the debates: A.N. Orlov (Frolovskiy Electoral Okrug, Volgograd Oblast), A.M. Fateyev (Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug, Leningrad City), A.V. Kalinin (Krasnosulinskiy Electoral Okrug, Rostov Oblast), I.A. Gabitov (Ilishevskiy Electoral Okrug, Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]), G.V. Khodasevich (Promyshlennyy Electoral Okrug, Kuybyshev Oblast), V.P. Gerasimov (Oktyabrskiy Electoral Okrug, Kurgan Oblast), F.M. Kotlyarenko (Novorossiyskiy Electoral Okrug, Krasnodar Kray), N.A. Sinetov (Kamchatskiy Electoral Okrug, Kamchatka Oblast), A.P. Firyulin (Proletarskiy Electoral Okrug, Tula Oblast), Yu.N. Ivanov (Priladozhskiy Electoral Okrug, Karelian ASSR), A.M. Kovalchuk (Cheremkhovskiy Electoral

Okrug, Irkutsk Oblast), V.I. Kobets (Magadanskiy Electoral Okrug, Magadan Oblast), V.F. Lutsenko (Ussuriyskiy Electoral Okrug, Maritime Kray), V.A. Desyatnikov (Leninskiy Electoral Okrug, Kirov Oblast), Yu. K. Abakumov (Taymyrskiy Electoral Okrug, Krasnoyarsk Kray), and V.V. Politov (Dzerzhinskiy Electoral Okrug, Sverdlovsk Oblast).

On this, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet concluded the debates on the first and second items on the session's agenda.

The fourth sitting of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet opened in the Great Kremlin Palace at 1600 hours.

Comrades V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, A.P. Biryukova, A.V. Vlasov, B.K. Pugo, G.P. Razumovskiy, O.D. Baklanov, A.N. Girenko, Yu.A. Manayenkov, and G.I. Usmanov took part in the evening sitting.

The sitting was chaired by Deputy N.M. Gribachev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

A concluding speech on the question of the draft State Plan for Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR for 1990 was delivered by USSR People's Deputy A.A. Khomyakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the RSFSR State Planning Committee.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution on the RSFSR State Plan for 1990 taking into account the proposals of the drafting commission and standing commissions of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet.

A concluding speech on the question of the draft RSFSR State Budget for 1990 and the implementation of the Russian Federation State Budget in 1988 was delivered by Deputy A.A. Bobrovnikov, RSFSR minister of finance.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet approved the RSFSR State Budget for 1990 taking into account the amendments of the Supreme Soviet standing commissions, and also approved the report on the implementation of the Russian Federation State Budget in 1988. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a Law on the RSFSR State Budget for 1990 and a resolution approving the report on the implementation of the RSFSR State Budget in 1988.

The deputies went on to examine the next item on the agenda—the ratification of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees. The deputies heard a report on this question from Deputy T.G. Ivanova, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and adopted appropriate RSFSR Supreme Soviet laws.

L.A. Gorshkov, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, replied to deputies' requests for a briefing on the measures being adopted in connection with the strikes in Vorkuta and the situation on certain railroads in the RSFSR. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted a corresponding resolution on the basis of the RSFSR government's briefing in response to the deputies' questions.

Following a proposal from Deputy V.V. Politov, the session adopted an RSFSR Supreme Soviet appeal to the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet for the normalization of the operation of railroad transport.

To conclude the session, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet heard a letter from Sverdlovsk Oblast deputies on questions of the acceleration of the Russian Federation's economic and social development, which was read out and commented on by Deputy V.I. Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

On this, the 12th RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session, 11th convocation, ended.

AUCCTU Plenum To Open 4 Dec

LD0312075489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Tomorrow in Moscow the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Plenum opens. It will concern the tactics and the position of the trade unions in the pre-election campaign. The new democratic system of elections and the activization of the most varied public organizations and forces promise an acute political struggle for influence in future republican and local power bodies.

Uzbek Plenum Discusses Nationalities Policy

LD0212124589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Tashkent, 24 Nov (TASS)—Iskander Khisamov, TASS correspondent, reports:

"We are beginning the restructuring of the nationalist policy by solving basic economic and social tasks," said Islam Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee. He spoke today at the Central Committee plenum dedicated to the questions of interethnic relations in this Soviet republic, where 20,000,000 inhabitants of more than 100 nationalities live.

Uzbekistan Obkom Party Secretary Elected

LD0212183689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] A plenum of the Surkhan-Darya Oblast Party Committee [obkom] was held today to examine an organizational matter. The plenum released Comrade Mamarasulov from his duties as first secretary in connection with his election as first secretary of the Tashkent Oblast Party Committee. Comrade (Berdyyev), who has been working as chairman of the Surkhan-Darya Oblast Executive Committee, was elected as first secretary of Surkhan-Darya Party Obkom.

Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee spoke at the plenum.

New Uzbek Deputy Premier Appointed

LD0112234489 Tashkent SOVET OZBEKISTONI in Uzbek 30 Nov 89 p 2

[Text] Decree of the Uzbekistan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium on the appointment of Comrade U.R. Umarbekov as deputy chairman of the Uzbekistan SSR Council of Ministers:

The Presidium of the Uzbekistan SSR decrees the relief of Comrade Ulmas Rakhimbekovich Umarbekov from his duty as minister of culture of the Uzbekistan SSR and his appointment as deputy chairman of the Uzbekistan SSR Council of Ministers.

[Signed] M. Ibragimov, chairman of the Uzbekistan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
L. Bekkulbekova, secretary of the Uzbekistan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
City of Tashkent, 16 November 1989

Akhmedov Elected Turkmenistan Premier

LD0112183189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] At a session of the Supreme Soviet of Turkmenistan the republic's plan and budget for next year has been confirmed. The speakers remarked that the documents had been drawn up on the basis of the new principles of union republics transferring to self-administration and self-financing. Of the three possible candidates, the session elected Akhmedov as chairman of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers by secret ballot.

Gasoline 'Crisis' Impedes Tajik Road Traffic

PM0112182989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Aleksandr Karpov report: "Transport Crisis"]

[Text] Dushanbe—In Tajikistan a critical situation has developed in terms of the national economy's gasoline supply. Some 50 percent of the republic's road transport is paralyzed. Freight traffic at many enterprises belonging to different ministries and departments is considerably reduced. Some special service transport—Ministry of Internal Affairs and emergency services operations vehicles—is standing idle. Work at many construction sites has stopped because materials and structures cannot be delivered. Petroleum products are not being shipped to regions of the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast. "Sovtransavto" vehicles loaded with grain for Afghanistan were unable to leave the republic in the last 6 days of November.

"The main causes of the crisis situation are the indiscipline of suppliers and the lack of tank cars at the loading depots at Pavlodar, Orsk, and Petropavlovsk," B. Kadreshov, first deputy chairman of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products, said. "As they told us at the USSR Ministry of Railways freight shipment department, gasoline supplies to Tajikistan are being disrupted because tank cars have been held up on the Alma-Ata, Virgin Lands, and Central Asian railroads."

The Tajik government has asked the USSR Council of Ministers to help in providing the republic with fuel.

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Holds Session

PM0412105189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent S. Tsikora under the rubric "Union Republic Supreme Soviet Sessions": "Ukrainian SSR"]

[Text] The session of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, which discussed the republic's plan and budget for next year, lasted for 2 days in Kiev.

A keen discussion flared up literally immediately after the government had submitted its plan for the economic and social development of the Ukraine in 1990. Here it was not individual deputies but the Supreme Soviet permanent commissions which acted as opponents. The leadership of the republic's State Agro-industrial Committee was more under attack than the others: Its plan for next year does not ensure the solution of the acute problem of supplying the population with meat, supplying small children with children's and dietetic foods, and young families with everything necessary to construct their houses and set up home. The deputies also leveled fair criticism against the State Agro-industrial Committee for the unsatisfactory fulfillment of the comprehensive program for the social restructuring of Ukrainian villages. It can no longer be tolerated, the participants in the session said, that about half the rural population schools have no schools, 60 percent have no children's preschool institutions, 24 percent no clubs, nearly 70 percent no bath houses, and 60 percent no consumer services enterprises.

Another Achilles heel of the state plan has been the production of consumer goods. Having analyzed in detail what the government proposes and having also analyzed the measures planned by the republic's State Planning Committee, State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, and ministries and departments, the Supreme Soviet commissions reached the unreassuring conclusion that there will be no substantial changes on the consumer market next year.

The package of government measures aimed at normalizing the ecological situation in the Ukrainian SSR received an even sterner assessment from the deputies. These proposals were frankly called unsatisfactory. They provided for an increase in the diversion of fresh spring

water, which is in very short supply, for industry, and the discharge of a considerable quantity of untreated domestic sewage into water expanses. A reduction in discharge into the atmosphere in one place and an increase in discharge elsewhere because of the commissioning of new enterprises was planned.

S. Konev, USSR people's deputy from Dnepropetrovsk, gave a sharp assessment of the government plan. He set out in thesis form the way the members of the Ukrainian people's movement for perestroyka—"Rukh"—see the further path for the Ukrainian economy's development. This alternative plan indicated many sore points in the republic's economy and cited methods for resolving them. Essentially he read out the program of the "Rukh" candidates at the elections to the republic's soviets of all levels. And although the proposals "not to approve" the government draft plan for 1990 were not supported by the deputies, in the unanimous opinion of those with whom I talked it will be hard for the candidates from other organizations to struggle against the alternative, vigorous "Rukh" program in the election campaign.

Deputy Views Ukrainian People's Movements

LD0212114689 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Telephone interview with USSR People's Deputy Chernovopiskiy by Vilnius Radio Commentator Benas Rupeika; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Rupeika] What are your grievances concerning the Ukrainian movement Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka]?

[Chervonopiskiy] I unreservedly support all informal groups in the Ukraine, such as Rukh, which are concerned about making life better. However, where their extremism is manifested, I do not agree with them. [passage omitted]

[Rupeika] Do you think that this is being imported into the Ukraine from the Baltic republics?

[Chervonopiskiy] I cannot give a definite answer here.

[Rupeika] In your historic speech you mentioned that messengers from Lithuanian movements...

[Chervonopiskiy, interrupting] No, not Lithuanian!

[Rupeika] The Baltic movements?

[Chervonopiskiy] Yes, the Baltic ones.

[Rupeika] So, what about this?

[Chervonopiskiy] Well, it does exist, because you know the representatives of the people's fronts paid visits to us. They used to come and meet people. This did take place and one cannot deny it; it is a fact.

[Rupeika] However, in spite of this, the support in the Ukraine is not because representatives of Baltic people's fronts visited the Ukraine. It seems that this ripened a long time ago.

[Chervonopiskiy] No, I do not think this is the main thing, but it remains a fact that the representatives came here. Has it been the main reason, as we say? Well, I doubt, of course.

[Rupeika] [passage omitted] What message would you like to sent to such organizations in Lithuania as Yedinstvo [Unity]? You know this organization, don't you?

[Chervonopiskiy] Yes, I do. Well, I would like to send a message, not only to Yedinstvo, but to all people's fronts in the Baltics, the interfronts like the Yedinstvo, and others, wishing them to find a path to a constructive dialogue. [passage omitted] To be more flexible because mutually acceptable solutions can be reached through compromise. [passage omitted]

[Rupeika] Am I right in saying that I notice evolution taking place in your statements?

[Chervonopiskiy] Evolution is a regular process in every man. I must tell you that I never was a radical where nationality an other such issues are concerned.

Ukrainian Uniate Church To Be Registered

LD0212172289 Moscow World News in English 0810 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] [Announcer] The authorities in the Western Ukraine have made a climb-down to ease high tensions there caused by the local supporters of the Uniate Church, which was abolished by the 1946 Senate in Lvov. More from our reporter:

[Unidentified reporter] Opinions on the decision varied, but it is generally held now that it had been part of Stalin purges of religion and congregation. But the crackdowns had failed to wipe out the Uniate, or the union of the Greek and Roman Catholic churches. Some counts say it is [as heard] now as many as five bishops and hundreds of priests and a congretagion of millions. With great effort underway now to turn the Soviet Union into a law-based country, further discrimination of these people is an anachronism. Moreover the procrastination of the legal status to the Unite Church has led some of its supporters to forcible seizures of temples. When things came to a head the local authorities had to concede.

[Announcer] Our reporter got on the line with the chairman of the Ukrainian Council for Religious Affairs, (Nikolay Kolesnik), who said the council had issued a statement saying that the Uniate congregation would be legalized if the parisioners agreed to comply with existing government regulations. (Nikolay Kolesnik) said the congregation is subject to registration, but not the church, because it depends for its existence on the parish. He also made it clear that the community would have to be run by law, and therefore would have to

release the temples it has seized. As for registration, local parishes could apply to the local authorities for the transfer of those places of worship. Asked if local parishes were likely to face resistance to being registered (Nikolay Kolesnik) said that this did not come into question because of heightened tensions. The chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Religious Affairs said a statement on the registration procedure had been published in all local newspapers in the western Ukraine, known to be the stronghold of the Uniate Church, and local parishes have now begun to send in applications.

Ukraine Procurator's Office Clears Militia

LD3011003889 Kiev in English to Europe 1900 GMT 28 Nov 89

[Text] The first results of preliminary investigation of the incident between groups of youths and law enforcement units which took place on October the [?1st] in Lvov have recently been promulgated in this Ukrainian city. The investigation carried out by the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Public Procurator's Office has come to the conclusion that the actions of the militiamen were evoked by necessity. However, these results contradict the conclusions of the Soviet parliament's special commission which carried out an independent investigation of the incident.

Belorussian Supreme Soviet To Discuss Elections

LD0412061189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] A session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet opens in Minsk today. The state plan for the republican socioeconomic development and budget for 1990 will be examined. The question of the elections of people's deputies of the republic and deputies of local soviets is also on the agenda.

Belorussian Immigration Figures Published

90UN0369A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 12 Nov 89 p 4

[Unattributed article: "Have You Decided To Emigrate?"]

[Text] "Some of my acquaintances have recently expressed a desire to leave the Soviet Union. I would be interested in knowing whether many people now want to live permanently abroad, and whether all succeed in so doing. [signed] V. Shapiro."

A reporter asked this question of the chief of the republic Visa and Registration Department, Sergey Ivanovich Stesik.

The number of departures for permanent residence and for personal reasons has risen sharply since the 28 August 1986 USSR Council of Ministers resolution. Judge for yourself: In 1986 more than 300 people left the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] for permanent residence, while in 1987 the number was about 600 and in 1988 some 2,200, while during the first 10 months of this year permission has been granted for 8,000 people to leave the country. Some 87% of those who leave to take up permanent residence elsewhere are persons of Jewish nationality, and they usually request to go to Israel because any request from there is sufficient. The other 13% go to other countries when they are sponsored by close relatives.

If we talk about private trips, during the first 10 months of the year there were 180,00, of which 80% were trips to Poland. The same is typical also of private trips into the Soviet Union: Of the 300,000 people who visited our republic this year, 90% were citizens of Poland. This trend is historical, and also a result of the fact that Poland is nearby and contacts and tourism are well established.

Those wishing to travel out of the country are now virtually never refused except in the case of "operating exigencies" [rezhimnost]. And even that is a temporary phenomenon, lasting only until the expiration of the periods when travel is banned.

As the number of departures has increased, our organization has been having its own problems. The workload has grown; and we have mostly women working for us, most of whom have families. But we have no opportunity to increase the staff of the Visa and Registration Department—only the central organs can solve our personnel problems. We are hoping for internal republic cost accounting.

It is difficult at present to predict the rates of further development in the departure process, since we expect changes in the near future: The USSR Supreme Soviet will be discussing the draft law on leaving and entering the USSR. The new law, essentially the first on this question, will become a new prism through which it will be possible to look at the processes of emigration and immigration. So let us not rush to hasty conclusions but wait for the law. It will provide the answers to many questions.

Belorussian Law on Constitutional Changes

90UN0299A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIY A in Russian 4 Nov 89 p 4

[Belorussian Supreme Soviet decree: "Procedure for the Initiation of the Law of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic 'Changes and Additions to the Belorussian SSR Constitution (Basic Law)'"]

[Text] In connection with the enactment of the law of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of 27 October 1989 "On Changes and Additions to the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Belorussian SSR," the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic decrees:

Article 1. The Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR retains its authority in accordance with the 1978 Belorussian SSR Constitution until the election of people's deputies of the Belorussian SSR, and the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Belorussian SSR until the formation of a new Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Belorussian SSR.

To determine that the edicts issued by the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Belorussian SSR not examined by the 11th convocation of the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR are to be submitted for examination by the newly elected Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR.

Article 2. The 5-year term of authority of the soviets of people's deputies established by Article 79 of the Constitution of the Belorussian SSR extends to the local soviets of people's deputies as of their new convocation.

Article 3. State bodies and officials accountable to the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR retain their authority until the formation or appointment of the corresponding bodies and officials by the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR.

Article 4. The provisions of articles 80 and 85 of the Constitution of the Belorussian SSR in the wording of the 27 October 1989 law of the Belorussian SSR establishing that a citizen may not be simultaneously a people's deputy in more than two soviets of people's deputies and also not allowing the election as people's deputies of officials appointed or elected by the soviets and their continuance in office for more than two terms in succession are applied from the time of the election of the soviets of people's deputies of the new convocation and from the time of their appointment or election of officials respectively.

Article 5. Judges and people's assessors exercise their authority until the election of a new bench of judges in the procedure stipulated by Article 151 of the Constitution of the Belorussian SSR in the version of the 27 October 1989 law of the Belorussian SSR.

[Signed] N. Dementey, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Belorussian SSR.
L. Syroyegina, secretary of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Belorussian SSR.
27 October 1989. Minsk.

Lithuanian Party Action Program Published

LD0312173389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1434 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius, 3 Dec (TASS)—TASS Correspondent Kazis Ustsila reports:

"Socialism as a structure of social justice"—this is the main aim set down in the draft "Lithuanian Communist Party Action Program" which is published today in the newspapers TIESA, SOVETSKAYA LITVA, and CZERWONY SZTANDAR.

The document establishes that "socialism is not a dogmatic, previously set-out scheme by sticking blindly to which an 'ideal society' is created, but an optimal socio-economic structure of a democratic society being creatively developed on the basis of existing, real life in which material prosperity and the fruits of culture are actually accessible to all members of society and human rights and the artistic self-expression of the individual are guaranteed."

The draft plan outlines the aims of the party in the sphere of ethnic, legal, and ecological policy, the spiritual renaissance of man, education, science, and ideological renewal.

The document establishes that "the formation of statehood and the path to sovereignty is a process with its own sequence and strategy." It is stressed that "the path proposed by us is peaceful, parliamentary, constitutional, and based on the good will and consensus of all of us, and on benevolent interest for each other."

"Our first objective is a sovereign and free Lithuanian state in the new Union of Soviet Republics," the draft "Lithuanian Communist Party Action Program states." Together with proposals and remarks from the republic's communists it will be submitted for study by the 20th extraordinary congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party which is opening in Vilnius on 19 December.

IAEA Experts Visit Lithuanian AES

LD0212203889 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius, Lithuania, December 2 TASS—A senior official of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] described the Ignalinskaya Nuclear Power Plant [AES] in Soviet Lithuania as one of the world's best.

Morris Rosen, deputy director general of the agency, worked at the plant for two weeks with IAEA coordinator Bernard Thomas and experts from Finland, Sweden, Yugoslavia, Spain, Britain and the United States.

The eight-member delegation were invited by the Soviet Government after Lithuanians, scared by the Chernobyl accident and alarmed by reported incidents at the six-million-kilowatt Ignalinskaya plant, made the authorities stop construction on a third reactor at the plant.

The IAEA experts described the incidents at Ignalinskaya as usual and posing no threat. They pointed to the high professional skills of the plant personnel.

The commission that checked safety standards at the plant also included officials from the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering and Lithuanian experts. The commission assessed the situation at the plant as positive.

Experts warn that Lithuania may be shot of electric power by 1995 or even earlier. Seeking to find an

alternative to the construction of a their reactor at Ignalinskaya, they propose changing the existing industrial structure in the republic, re-orientating industry to production processes requiring less energy, and building nuclear power plants with low-power reactors.

So far it is clear that the freezing of the contruction of a third reactor has not facilitated the problems's solution. Moreover, starting next year Lithuania will be economically autonomous and will have to rely on itself to solve its problems.

Latvian Social Democratic Party Convenes in Riga

LD0212185289 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Riga December 2 TASS—By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina:

The restoration of activities of the Latvian Social Democratic Workers' party throughout the territory of the Baltic Republic has been announced today.

The party opened its congress in the resort town of Jurmala today. The previous forum of the party, established in 1904, was held in Latvia 55 years ago.

The current two-day congress will adopt the party's policy documents.

Congress Ends 3 Dec

LD0312143789 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Riga December 3 TASS—A congress of the Latvian Social Democratic Labour Party ended here today.

The party was founded in 1904 and has resumed its activities after a period of almost half a century. The delegates endorsed the party's rules and elected its leading bodies.

Latvian Parliament Presidium Discusses Draft Laws

LD0212120489 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 2100 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Text] A meeting of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium took place today. Changes and amendments in some Latvian SSR legislative acts regarding questions of the election of people's deputies were discussed.

Members of the Presidium examined the question of establishing new village soviets in Balvi, Dobele, and Riga Rayons of the Latvian SSR, and on renaming some village soviets in Balvi, Jelgava, Liepaja, and Rezekne Rayons.

The Presidium formed a commission that will draw up a draft law on constitutional supervision and a commission that will prepare proposals for drawing up regulations of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Two working groups were formed: One of them will draw up proposals in connection with the USSR draft law on ownership in the USSR; the second will prepare proposals in order to draw up the Latvian SSR draft law on the status of people's deputies in the Latvian SSR.

On the agenda of the meeting was a question on recommendations concerning how the first sessions of local soviets of people's deputies are to be prepared and organized.

The republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium also examined other questions.

Estonian Supreme Soviet To Meet 6 Dec

LD0112160989 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Summary] The Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet met today and discussed the agenda for the next Supreme Soviet session on 6 December. There will be 14 points on the agenda and a particular emphasis on the farmstead law.

Estonian Labor Collectives on Elections

90UN0271A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 2 Nov 89 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Thus Believes the United Labor Collective Council"]

[Text] **In the last issue of the newspaper we completed the publication of a series of articles discussing the activity of various political forces during the period of preparation for the elections to local self-management organs. But it is too soon to put an end to the discussion that was started. Today we are publishing the viewpoint of the OSTK [United Labor Collective Council] of the ESSR [Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic].**

The preparations for the elections to the local soviets of people's deputies are proceeding in a situation of apathy and political passivity on the part of many voters. A number of labor collectives included in the OSTK have essentially refused to participate in the preparations for the elections. As usual, the question of boycotting the elections has not been removed from the agenda.

There is a real threat of a split among the workers, which in the current political situation when ultraradical forces are changing over to a decisive offensive can lead to a weakening of the positions of the labor collectives.

We think that the existing situation was caused by the stubborn refusal of Estonian SSR legislators to hear the voices of a considerable number of citizens who are demanding guarantees of the observance of their political rights. Justifiable distress is caused by the refusal on the part of the republic supreme soviet to introduce individual articles into the ESSR law on elections to

local soviets in keeping with the USSR Constitution and the Ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 16 August 1989.

The lack of criteria for electing deputies and the multiple mandate system in combination with the "California" system of counting and registering votes make the people mistrustful of the forthcoming elections.

Under these conditions the United Council declares:

1. Participation in the elections is the voluntary affair of each citizen and is based on the free expression of his will.

At the same time the OSTK ESSR as a social organization considers it possible to call for labor collectives to participate in the elections on 10 December of this year only under the conditions of the observance of articles 34, 48, 74, 95, and 96 of the USSR Constitution of 16 August 1989. This means that we retain the right to nominate citizens living in the Estonian SSR as candidate deputies regardless of their length of residence and we demand that they be registered. The OSTK also supports those candidate deputies nominated by military units in the place where they are stationed.

2. An indispensable condition for the participation of the United Labor Collective Council in the elections is the formation in Morskoy and Kalininskiy Rayons of single-mandate okrugs as dictated in the decisions of the plenum of the Morskoy Raykom [rayon committee] of the KPE [Communist Party of Estonia] and the aktiv of Kalininskiy Rayon in Tallinn.

The OSTK declares that the participation of its collective members and adherents in the elections to local soviets of people's deputies is unthinkable unless the aforementioned conditions have been met. If these conditions are not met the management organs of the Untied Council have no choice but to call for the workers not to participate in the unconstitutional elections on 19 December 1989 and begin preparations for the elections of worker deputies according to the production-territorial indicator.

Adopted at a meeting of the expanded council of representatives of the ESSR OSTK on 25 October 1989.

Estonian Komsomol Sets March Dissolution Deadline

PM2911132189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 89 p 1

[Correspondent G. Sapozhnikova report: "To Be Or Not To Be? That Was the Question at the 21st Estonian Komsomol Congress"]

[Text] Tallinn—A most interesting discussion began on the 2d day of the congress' work when delegates, who had spent the whole of the previous day working on Estonian Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] resolutions (thus, on the future of their union), reached the third item on the agenda: "On the Existence of the Estonian Komsomol."

The Tartu delegation elaborated its version of the resolution, proposing that the Estonian Komsomol's activity be considered terminated with no right to continue as of 25 November 1989, the monies in the Estonian Komsomol account be transferred to the republic's Council of Ministers or the local budgets of the cities and rayons, a commission be created to transfer Komsomol property, Estonian Komsomol Central Committee press organs should decide their fate themselves, and organs of power provide young people with a means of attaining executive power.

This version was not passed....

A resolution was adopted "On the Estonian Komsomol."

The preamble and its main provision read as follows: "Proceeding on the premise that the internal organizational work of most primary organizations has ceased, that Estonian young people have no need for a mass political organization at this moment, and that the Estonian Komsomol's influence as an organization on the republic's internal political life has effectively ended, the 21st Estonian Komsomol Congress resolves:

to proclaim a transitional period for the Estonian Komsomol through 1 March 1990, at which point the activity of the Estonian Komsomol based on the current statute will be considered terminated...

Ayvar Rauam, who worked previously as secretary of the republic's Komsomol Central Committee, was elected Estonian Komsomol Central Committee first secretary for the transitional period.

Viktor Mironenko, first secretary of the All-Union Komsomol, took part in the work of the congress.

Estonia's Ryuytel on Republic Sovereignty

PM3011164989 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 24 Nov 89 p 18

[FINSKA NOTISBYRAN report of interview in Tallinn with Estonian President Arnold Ryuytel: "Completely New National Awakening in Estonia"; date not specified]

[Text] Tallinn—"In Estonia at present people are talking about a completely new national awakening," was Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic President Arnold Ryuytel's comment to FINSKA NOTISBYRAN on the resolution passed recently by the Estonian parliament that the incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union in 1940 was illegal.

President Ryuytel said that the acceptance of historical truth in recent months has been an inseparable part of the Soviet Union's policy of reform, perestroyka:

"Only by freeing ourselves from the ballast of history can we move forward on the road of real reform. A critical historical-judicial and political investigation of Stalin's crimes is a necessary part of this process."

Ryuytel considers it natural that the Supreme Soviet recently—on the initiative of the Baltic states—appointed a commission to investigate the agreements the Soviet Union signed with Germany in 1939.

The Estonian parliament must also take part in this investigation. However, the Estonians called for an investigation by their own parliament, which would be quicker than the commission could be, and therefore collected 400,000 names on a petition. In the petition the Estonians demand that the official truth that has prevailed hitherto be declared invalid because it does not accord with the "folk memory."

On 12 November the Estonian parliament decided on the basis of the report of a special commission that the incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union was illegal. At the same time the parliament stressed that it reserves the right to negotiate its relations with the Soviet Union and to negotiate internationally as a sovereign state, Ryuytel said.

Asked who would arrange such negotiations and how, Ryuytel said:

"This question must be decided by time itself. It will not be easy."

According to President Ryuytel, the Estonians are in complete agreement with President Mikhail Gorbachev over the idea of a common European home.

However, Estonia itself must first clarify its own international position and related questions, Ryuytel said, noting that not a single country of any significance for the "European process" recognizes Estonia's present position.

"The problems that have gone hand in hand with history right up to the present have been an obstacle to relations between Estonia and the sovereign Soviet republics and Estonia's neighbors around the Baltic Sea."

According to President Ryuytel, the basis on which Estonia can participate in European integration is the declaration of sovereignty adopted by the Estonian parliament on 16 November 1988 which declared the 1940 incorporation illegal.

"I believe that Estonia could be a bridge between East and West, that we could be of assistance in the attempts to resolve the antagonisms in Europe," President Ryuytel said.

Law on Republican Economic Autonomy

PM0112160089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 First Edition pp 1, 3

["USSR Law on the Economic Autonomy of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Latvian SSR, and the Estonian SSR"]

[Text] The law on the economic autonomy of republics pursues objectives that reflect the democratization of the USSR and perestroyka in economic policy. The law enshrines the right of sovereign union republics autonomously to manage their economy, and provides for their equal participation in interrepublican union activity.

The provisions of the present law operate with respect to republics within the USSR's federal system.

The law is based on the following principles:

the combination of the economic autonomy of republics and the established functions of the USSR;

the expansion of commodity-money relations in intrarepublican and interrepublican economic ties and the creation of an effective USSR market;

the combination of the economic autonomy of republics and self-management by local organs and economically accountable enterprises;

the improved utilization of the specific conditions of the union republics' development;

the interest of republics and local organs of management in, and their responsibility for, the growth of living standards and economic potential, and on that basis the strengthening of the USSR.

Article 1. In the republics switching to economic autonomy, their highest organs of state power and administration carry out, within the framework of USSR laws:

1) the adoption of legislative acts ensuring the perestroyka and functioning of the republic's socioeconomic system;

2) the ownership, use, and management of land and other natural resources in their territory in the interests of the republic and of the USSR;

3) the economic regulation of the activity of all sectors and economic entities located in the republic's territory;

4) the leadership of the republic's financial system and the activity of republican banks (with the exception of institutions in the USSR State Bank system);

5) the formation of the republic's system of state income in accordance with the legislation of the republics and of the USSR, and the formation of autonomous republican and local budgets;

6) the setting of differentiated conditions for labor remuneration, pensions, grants, and allowances and the establishment of a pricing procedure in the republics' territory;

7) the leadership of the republic's foreign economic activity in compliance with agreed norms established between the republics and the USSR;

8) the management of the state fund of natural resources and the setting of upper limits, normatives, and legal norms for the utilization of natural resources, as well as the associated issuing of permits and imposition of bans on the activity of enterprises, organizations, and businesses [khozyaystva];

9) the creation of a financial market attracting funds from other republics and foreign countries, as well as all-union financial resources, on mutually beneficial principles.

Article 2. The basis of the republics' new economic mechanism is the autonomy of enterprises, institutions, organizations, and businesses carrying out their activity on the basis of the principles of economic accountability and equality of all forms of ownership. Enterprises may autonomously conclude contracts with economic partners and enter into republican, interrepublican, union, and other associations on a voluntary basis. In so doing, the enterprises, institutions, and organizations continue to comply with the laws of the republic.

By agreement between the USSR Government and the republic government, union ministries, committees, and departments transfer to the ownership of the people of the republic enterprises and economic organizations with all their fixed and circulating capital. Budget income generated in the republic's territory is distributed between the union budget and the budget of the union republic in accordance with the legislation of the USSR and the union republic.

By agreement between the USSR and the republic, the resources of the armed forces, main oil and gas pipelines, and other facilities of unionwide significance are classified as being under union ownership.

The transfer of fixed and circulating capital to the republic's ownership does not change the existing integrated engineering structures (transport, electricity transmission lines, and so forth).

The ruble is used as the basis for interrepublican accounts.

Article 3. An economically autonomous republic has a budget and determines the sources and volume of generation of budgetary resources. The procedure for compilation and utilization of the republic state budget (which does not form part of the USSR budget) and the rights and duties of the controllers of budget appropriations are defined by the republic's organs of state power and administration.

The republic takes part on a mutually beneficial and voluntary basis in the financing from its budget of all-union (interrepublican) scientific and technical programs and insurance funds for environmental conservation, as well as the formation of reserve and other monetary funds for the normal functioning of the union market.

Article 4. The republic's organs of state power and administration carry out the switch to primarily financial, monetary, and credit levers for regulating the republican market, which is carried out by the appropriate bodies according to their competence.

Article 5. The appropriate organs of the USSR and the republics ensure the maintenance and development of interrepublican economic ties, as well as monetary relations, to rule out all forms of economic discrimination. The republics take on contractual commitments in interrepublican trade turnover in the light of the centralized distribution of resources, stocks, and quotas. Until the complete transition to wholesale trade, the USSR State Planning Committee and the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, following the procedure laid down for the national economy as a whole, allocate to the republics' Councils of Ministers quotas for centrally distributed resources, without distributing them among sectors and fields of activity.

Article 6. Economic relations in the Lithuanian SSR, Latvian SSR, and Estonian SSR are regulated by the republican constitutions, the Lithuanian SSR Law "On the Principles of Economic Autonomy of the Lithuanian SSR," the Latvian SSR Law "On the Economic Autonomy of the Latvian SSR," the Estonian SSR Law "On the Principles of Economic Accountability of the Estonian SSR," and the relevant USSR laws.

It is stipulated that legislative acts of the USSR governing economic relations operate in the territories of the said republics insofar as they do not hamper their switch to economic autonomy.

The Lithuanian SSR, Latvian SSR, and Estonian SSR, which are the first to go over to economic autonomy, may voluntarily participate in the approbation and implementation of measures formulated by USSR organs and union republics with regard to radical economic reform that relate to the economic autonomy of a republic.

The law enters into force as a single whole [v obshchem poryadke].

[Signed] M. Gorbachev,

Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Moscow, Kremlin, 27 November 1989.

Sobchak on Baltic Supreme Soviet Walkout

90UN0351D Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 47, 25 Nov 89 p 7

[Text] It is said that on Monday, 20 November, Baltic republic delegates walked out of the USSR Supreme Soviet meeting hall in protest. Is this true and what is the explanation for such behavior?

[Signed] S. Baramokhin, Moscow Oblast.

Our correspondent A. Ulganov asked USSR People's Deputy A. Sobchak for an explanation.

Delegates from the Baltic republics did indeed leave the meeting hall for a certain time in the morning of 20 November. The point being that in the summer session we had adopted the decision to examine at the second session a bill on the Baltic republics' economic independence. Now, however, attempts were made on various pretexts not to examine it and, consequently, to evade fulfillment of our own decision.

The deputies from the Baltic area, incidentally, did not insist on passage of this bill, merely that it be examined precisely in accordance with the decision of the first session. It has to be said that they were absent merely for the amount of time that discussion was under way in the meeting hall of the law on general principles of leadership of the economic and social sphere in the union republics. When a majority of Supreme Soviet members rejected this bill, they returned to the hall. In the event, however, of the passage of this bill, the fate of the bill on the economic independence of the Baltic republics would have been predetermined.

So in point of fact their position was correct, but we should all think very hard about the use of "strike" methods in parliamentary work....

Opinion Poll Conducted on Interethnic Relations

LD1711115189 Moscow TASS in English 0846 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Vadim Kokarev:

A public opinion poll taken recently by the All-Union Public Opinion Studies Centre among the population of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, the Russian Federation, and the Ukraine has confirmed the need for in-depth changes in inter-ethnic relations, the importance of which was emphasised at the September plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

More than a thousand urban and rural dwellers above 16 years of age were polled.

Forty-one per cent of the respondents in the Baltic Republics agree with the idea voiced at the plenum: The exacerbation of inter-ethnic relations is connected with the command-and-administrative management methods that caused tremendous damage to the realisation of the versatile interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

This opinion is shared by every fifth respondent in the Ukraine and the Russian Federation.

An overwhelming majority of the participants in the survey are convinced of the need to decentralise the economy, extend the rights of the republics, strengthen their sovereignty and determine the official language of the republics.

Sixty-two per cent of respondents in the Russian Federation, 78 in the Ukraine, and 85 in the Baltic Republics recognise these priorities.

The opinion poll demonstrated that the indigenous residents of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the Ukraine spoke out against any use of pressure, ultimatums or violence when conflict situations develop in inter-ethnic relations.

Bakatin speaks at Komsomol School

LD2611014989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0000 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] a state program has been drawn up to combat crime, the links between the internal affairs bodies and labor collectives are being strengthened, the militia's technical back-up is improving, and international contacts are increasing, including with Interpol. This was reported by Bakatin, the USSR minister of internal affairs, at a meetindg with students, the professorial and lecturing staff, and journalists from youth publications held in the Komsomol Central Committee's Higher Komsomol School.

Baklanov Visits Test Flight Institute

PM2011161389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting With Test Pilots"]

[Text] The people and collectives whose task is to give new machines a start in life play a crucial role. The USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry M.M. Gromov Test Flight Institute resolves such questions in the sphere of aviation equipment. CPSU Central Committee Secretary O.D. Baklanov visited it 15 November.

At the sector's main testing center a detailed discussion took place with aircraft designers and leading specialists as to what should be done to ensure that new-generation aviation equipment comes into operation more rapidly. Today the country's airlines are in acute need of more comfortable and economical passenger liners such as the Il-96 and the Tu-204.

The testing stage is one of the most crucial phases in the preparations for series production of such equipment. It is here that the safety of millions of future passengers is guaranteed. Test pilots work to this end at the risk of their own lives. Several hundred such specialists,

including those working on the "Buran" space shuttle system, have been trained at the test flight institute.

Their working and living conditions were the main topic of the discussion between the CPSU Central Committee secretary and the sector's test flight personnel. There was a detailed and businesslike discussion of ways to create most favored conditions in production and in the social sphere for people in this dangerous profession. It was stressed that the success of their work and the prestige of this courageous profession depend in many respects on the resolution of these questions.

O.S. Belyakov, head of the CPSU Central Committee Defense Department, A.S. Systsov, minister of the USSR aviation industry, and B.I. Balashov, secretary of Moscow CPSU Oblast Committee, took part with O.D. Baklanov in discussing this series of questions.

Biryukova Visits Ivanteyevka Knitwear Factory

LD1811221589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Workers of the Ivanteyevka Dzerzhinskiy knitwear production association, one of the largest and oldest light industry enterprises in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, had a meeting on 17 November with A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. After taking a look around the factory, Comrade Biryukova met blue and white collar workers in one of the workshops. A frank and sharp discussion took place both on matters that concern all the people, and the factory's specific problems.

The deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers described in detail the measures being adopted by the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and the country's government to increase production of consumer goods, accelerate a solution to the housing problem, develop the material base of the sociocultural sphere, regulate in a legal and financial sense the activities of the cooperatives, and to solve other social problems. She also replied to a number of questions. Ways to solve several specific production and social problems in the collective were outlined.

Meets With Workers

PM2111111589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "More High-Quality and Different Goods"]

[Text] Workers at Ivanteyevka's Dzerzhinskiy Knitwear Production Association—one of the largest and oldest light industry enterprises in Russia—met with A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, 17 November.

Over the last few years light industry has frequently been criticized—justifiably by and large—for its slow assimilation of new methods of economic activity, low growth rates for the production of outerwear, footwear, knitted goods, and fabrics, particularly in physical terms, the poor range and low quality of many goods, and its passion for contract prices to the detriment of the production of inexpensive goods.

The results of the work of the association near Moscow indicate emergent changes for the better in this sector, which is highly important from the social viewpoint. In the first 3 years of the 5-year plan the collective fulfilled the control figures for the manufacture of knitted goods and light industry goods at retail prices. The enterprise is also working stably this year.

A.P. Biryukova particularly noted the collective's well thought-out work for the future aimed at scaling new heights over the next few years in meeting people's requirements for knitted goods in terms of quantity, range, and quality. The main components in this work are as follows: the enterprise's wide-ranging reconstruction and retooling on the basis of the introduction of state-of-the-art equipment and progressive technologies, the development of a network of subsidiaries, including in rural areas, the organization of cooperation on a contractual basis with state farms and collective farms for this purpose, the boosting of the role of financial and commercial services, and prompt updating of the range in accordance with market demands and fashion.

The fact that while increasing production of higher-quality goods at contractual prices, the enterprise has not forgotten the needs of pensioners, elderly people, children, impoverished families, and young people merits approval, the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers stressed.

Subsidiaries of the association have specialized in producing goods at socially low prices, for these population groups and technological production systems have been organized at the main enterprise.

A considerable amount is being done to improve working and living conditions for the association's workers. There are clinics, hostels, preschool establishments, a Palace of Culture, and a sports complex.

Following her familiarization with the enterprise A.P. Biryukova met workers and employees at one workshop. They had a frank, interested, and sometimes trenchant discussion—both about questions worrying the entire people and about the enterprise's specific problems.

The collective's most acute social problem, as is the case at virtually all light industry enterprises, is the housing problem. Some 390 families are waiting in line for apartments; moreover, 510 people are living in dilapidated housing stock. Veterans are also among those in need. Some workers said resentfully and bitterly that, having given the enterprise 35-40 years of their labor, they have seen simply no improvement in their housing

conditions and live in confined circumstances. The association does have funds for housing construction—and considerable ones at that—however, it has not proved possible to utilize them for these purposes owing to local construction organizations' lack of capacities. As a result, the housing line is not dwindling, but increasing. That is one of the main reasons why more and more workers, particularly young people, are leaving the association and the collective is aging.

Many questions have also accumulated in the production sphere. We realize how much the people need our goods and we want to increase production, workers said. But how can we do this if there are frequent holdups with the supply of raw materials, dyes, and chemicals? If we lack platinum needles? If the quality of the raw materials supplied by associated plants is low and so on?

In this connection the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers urged the labor collective council, the administration, and all workers to rid themselves more rapidly of such a tenacious stereotype of the administrative-edict system as expectation of orders and decisions on all questions from above. Full use must be made of the extensive rights granted to labor collectives by perestroyka and economic and political reform and professionalism and enterprise must be displayed. What or who, for instance, is preventing an independent investigation with the suppliers into the reasons for the poor quality of the raw materials and semimanufactures, an acceptable solution to socioconsumer and transport problems being found with the city soviet executive committee, and assistance with individual housing construction for those who so desire? Nothing and no one. Initiative and specific organizational work alone are needed.

The association's workers raised with great concern and insistence the question of the need to assert and strengthen the principle of social justice more vigorously in all spheres of the life of our society. We must not, the workers stated, continue to tolerate some people working any which way, as they say, effectively serving time at work while having the same social security and rights to various social benefits and privileges as conscientious good workers. It was also said that it is time to act to erect legal and financial barriers in the way of those cooperatives that are effectively engaged in speculative activity rather than just talking about it.

The deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers talked in detail to the association's workers about the steps being taken by the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the country's government to increase consumer goods production, speed up resolution of the housing problem, develop the material base for the sociocultural sphere, legally and financially regulate cooperatives' activity, and resolve other social problems, including the problems of pensions and vacations, and answered a number of questions.

Ways of resolving some of the collective's specific production and social problems were outlined.

Lukyanov on Supreme Soviet Second Session

LD0112143989 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet is actively laying down the foundations of a socialist law-based state, reaffirming deep allegiance to perestroyka and strengthening the guarantees of its irreversibility, Soviet First Vice President Anatoliy Lukyanov told PRAVDA today.

Commenting on the second session of the Soviet parliament, he stressed the important role of permanent commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet as the forum for preliminary analytical and expert work to prepare issues for discussion by the Supreme Soviet. On the whole committees and commissions held nearly 350 meetings during the second session.

Lukyanov said that reorganisation of the USSR Supreme Soviet also affected Soviet foreign policy. For the first time in many years the president of the USSR Supreme Soviet reported on the results of his visits to Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and France, and on the meeting of the political consultative committee of Warsaw Treaty states. Also for the first time the Soviet foreign minister delivred a report on the work of the Soviet Foreign Ministry since April 1985. Such reports will be continued in future as well.

In the conditions of perestroyka, Lukyanov said, the importance of direct contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and foreign parliaments is increasing. These contacts help assert new political thinking in international relations and create real possibilities for a joint search for mutually acceptable solutions to the most urgent problems.

Medvedev Addresses Science Conference

LD2611062189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1532 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 25 November (TASS)—Today the conference of party organizations of the establishments of the USSR Academy of Sciences began work. It has been convened on the initiative of the secetaries of the party organizations of a number of academic institutes as a stage in the preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress. About 300 delegates have gathered for the forum, representing 180 party organizations of the establishments of the Academy of Sciences. In the course of the 2 days they are to discuss proposals on the formation of a congress platform of the party and amendments to the CPSU rules put forward by primary party organizations and individual communists of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Vadim Medvedev, Politburo member and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, spoke to the conference delegates.

Pugo Addresses Session of Gdlyan Commission

PM2011145989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Morning Edition p6

["Own information" report: "Commission Sitting"]

[Text] A scheduled sitting of the Congress Commission for the Verification of Material Connected With the Work of the USSR Prosecutor's Office Investigations Group Led by T.Kh. Gdlyan was held on 15 November under the chairmanship of USSR People's Deputy R.A. Medvedev.

B.K. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, took part in the commission's work. He gave a principled assessment of cases of organized criminal activity by a number of former party and soviet leaders of Uzbekistan and talked about the nature of statements and complaints sent to the Party Control Committee about some members of the investigation group headed by T.Kh. Gdlyan who carried out investigations in Uzbekistan. B.K. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, then answered numerous questions from members of the Congress Commission.

Sakharov Calls for Strike To Challenge Party

AU0212150289 Paris AFP in English 1249 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec 2 (AFP)—Reformist deputy Andrey Sakharov called Saturday for a two-hour general strike to be held throughout the Soviet Union on December 11 to press for an end to the Communist Party's leading role.

The strike would fall on the eve of the second session of the Congress of People's Deputies or parliament on December 12.

Six million people took part in a two-hour strike in Czechoslovakia last Monday in response to an opposition call for a symbolic stoppage to protest against the Communist Party's constitutional right to rule.

Mr. Sakharov, a physicist whose campaign for human rights won him the Nobel Peace Prize, said the strike would also back demands for parliament to pass new laws on private land and property.

He denounced alleged "organized resistance" that he said had emerged in the Soviet Union against adopting "essential economic laws".

The strike call, read by Mr. Sakharov to AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE by telephone, was signed by four other members of parliament, including Mr. Sakharov's wife, Yelena Bonner. All support radical economic reform, particularly in agriculture.

The other signatories were Gavril Popov, one of the co-chairmen of the Inter-Regional Group of liberal MPs [Members of Parliament], Vladimir Tikhonov, member of the Academy of Agricultural Sciences and head of the Union of Soviet Cooperatives, Arkady Murachev, a liberal MP from Moscow, and Yuri Chernichenko, an agricultural expert.

The appeal called for abrogation of the Soviet Consitution's Clause 6, which guarantees the party a leading role.

It warned that if a land law setting out new rules for farming were not passed, "another farming year will fail", and if action were not taken on legislation concerning property and enterprises "ministries and departments will rule as before".

Neither draft economic legislation aimed at liberalizing the economy and ushering in private enterprise, nor removal of clause 6, are on the agenda of parliament's second session.

Deputies decided against including clause 6, despite stormy debate over the issue during the last session.

Only parliament can make constitutional amendments.

Mr. Sakharov's appeal warned that if the party's supremacy were not ended "the crisis of confidence in the party and the leadership will grow".

It called for a "warning general strike" to be held from 10 to 12 a.m. (0700 to 0900 GMT) December 11.

Signatories called for strike committees to be organized in workplaces and ended their appeal with the rallying phrases: "Property for the people", "Land for the peasants", "All power to the Soviets". Soviets are the country's locally elected assemblies.

Mr. Sakharov called on the mass media to broadcast the strike appeal daily until December 11.

Referring to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's reform campaign, he told AFP he believed "economic perestroika has not really begun" and that delaying changing economic legislation for another year would have "very serious consequences".

On the pro-democracy movement sweeping Eastern Europe, he said the Soviet Union "was behind compared with the events" rocking Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria and Hungary.

The events there made reform in the Soviet Union all the more necessary, he said.

He stressed that the tide of reform in other Eastern Bloc states also "strengthens the resistance led by conservative forces who feel threatened".

Kharkov To Commemorate Victims of Repression, War

PM2711123789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Anatoliy Kleva dispatch: "Memorials To Be Erected"]

[Text] Kharkov—IZVESTIYA has already reported on the fact that several informal associations in Kharkov held a civil memorial service 4 November in memory of the victims of the 1930's and put up a wooden cross in one of the parks (on the site of the former common graves)....

The Kiyevskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee reacted self-critically to the informal associations' fast work: It invited the organizers of the rally and memorial service to a dialogue at an Executive Committee session. Together they worked out a decision on perpetuating the memory of the victims of the 1933 famine in a worthy way.

A competition is also to be announced in the city to design a memorial to the victims of Stalinist repression. It will be erected in Komsomol Park in Moskovskiy Rayon, on the site of the former secret cemetery for those shot in 1937-1938.

The inhabitants of Kharkov are showing a desire to participate personally in establishing the memorials: They are tidying up the sites, collecting resources, and checking the accuracy of the lists of victims. Last spring the city soviet executive committee headed a movement to identify the tens of thousands of martyrs from the Jewish ghetto and the prisoner-of-war camps and those killed by the fascists in Drobitskiy Yar. Now an avenue has been laid out there and a memorial is being designed for which the city's inhabitants have donated hundreds of thousands of rubles....

Scientific

Details Given on 'Mir' Space Activities

'Progress M' Burns in Atmosphere

LD0112150189 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—A Soviet programme to test a modified unmanned spaceship of a new series, Progress M, has been completed and the craft was sent to the dense layers of the atmosphere were it burned up.

The spacecraft, placed in orbit on August 23, delivered to the Soviet manned space station Mir (peace) more than two tonnes of cargo.

The flight path of the orbital research complex was adjustd using the propulsion units of the freight craft.

Progress M undocked from the station at 12:02 Moscow time today. It was programmed to follow a descent trajectory, entered the dense layers of the atmosphere and ceased to exist.

The cosmonauts Alekandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov are continuing their work on board the Mir station. According to the results of a medical check-up, they are in good health.

In keeping with the flight programme, the special module Kvant-2 and the manned complex Mir were manoeuvred closer to each other. According to telemetry information, the on-board systems of the two spacecraft are functioning normally.

'Kvant-Mir' Docking Postponed

LD0212164989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1634 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Flight Control Center, 2 Dec (TASS)—The docking of the 'Kvant-2' module with the Mir orbital complex, which was scheduled for today, has not taken place due to a malfunction in one of the module's automatic control systems. It has been decided to carry out the docking of the space vessels on 6 December.

Two adjustments were made to the module's trajectory today to enable it to rendezvous with the Mir orbital complex.

'Kvant' Problems Detailed

PM0112115389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Rebrov report: "'Kvant-2': Complex Situation"—first two paragraphs are TASS report]

[Text] Mission Control Center, 27 Nov—During the past 24 hours of the flight of the specialized "Kvant-2" module the on-board telemetry it has transmitted has been processed and analyzed. The situation that emerged due to the incomplete deployment of one of the solar panels has been modeled and the spacecraft's dynamic characteristics have been clarified. The necessary ground experiments to elaborate the sequence of Mission Control operations have also been put in place.

The module's flight conditions have been precisely defined on the basis of the data obtained.

Mission Control Center, 28 Nov—Worries arose after the launcher's final-stage boosters were switched off and the "craft" was placed in orbit. During this period the automatic monitoring systems "interrogate" everything that should be "opening," "moving forward," "slowing," "starting up," or "shutting down" and transmit the data to earth by telemetry. That was how the signal arrived from space that one of the solar panels had not fully opened.

The report was brief and merely stated the fact itself. But what did it indicate, how would this situation affect the

rest of the 'Kvant-2' mission and, above all, its docking with 'Mir?' There were many questions. What position was the panel in? How was the backup power pack working? Would there be enough power to work all the systems involved in the docking procedure? How would the flight dynamics change? What should the orientation be?

For the rest of the day and night after the launch and for the following 24 hours the Mission Control Center worked flat out. Analyzing the information coming in from the instruments, the specialists concluded that in all probability the panel was covering part of the engine used to control the module's position. It was also established that the power balance was falling. An extremely complex situation was taking shape.

People sought the only correct solution out of the many seemingly logical and possible solutions. Through calculation and modeling it proved possible to select a solar orientation mode [rezhim orientatsii na Solntse] without starting up the "shrouded" engines. An essentially delicate operation had to be carried out so as to prevent additional complications. With the greatest caution and after considerable doubts attempts were made to start up the actual engines which had been accidentally "covered up"....

That night those present at the Mission Control Center monitored proceedings in a tense silence. By the morning of 28 November the telemetry brought the important report that there was a positive power balance!

This means that the backup power pack had worked and was close to normal. This means that it is possible to hope that subsequent work will be carried out successfully. But it still does not mean that all the difficulties and problems are over. The automatic docking software stored in the computer memory is based on certain dynamic spaceflight characteristics which have now changed. Recalculations, new models, and highly accurate solutions are needed.

In short, the fate of 'Kvant-2' now depends on the professionalism of those controlling the module's flight, the equipment's reserve potential, and the precise and timely implementation of all operations.

I have been observing the Mission Control Center's work during the past tense 24 hours, and I have heard the specialists' comments—these were severe, unambiguous, and restrained, but optimistic. I very much believe that they will resolve this highly difficult task, although I repeat that the situation is very complex.

Further Details on Problems

LD0312114189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1416 GMT on 2 December interrupts its scheduled music program with a 7- minute report by special correspondents Vladimir Bezyayev and Leonid Lazarevich from the Flight Control Center.

One correspondent begins the announcement that due to an "unexpected" situation, the report will not focus on the Kvant-Mir docking. The correspondent says that they will instead report on the difficulties: "The flight of Kvant-2 has been very difficult." The correspondent recalls the initial failure of one of the solar panels to open. "Later, we found out that the solar panel had opened, and on subsequent days, everything went according to plan. But we learned that new complications arose in the morning."

The correspondent then introduces pilot-cosmonaut Vladimir Aleksandrovich Dzhanibekov. The correspondent says to Dzhanibekov: "As far as I know, the control system is not operating." Dzhanibekov replies: "I would not describe the situation like that. It is one of those routine situations, fairly well-studied by us, in which—for some reason—the package of data, the data bank, does not get through completely to the station for the subsequent (?dynamic) operations. This led to an overloading of the memory of the computer complex onboard the Mir station and then, as they say, to an emergency stoppage of that complex. Nonetheless, a disruption in the station's automatic equipment system was registered. Thus, we were unable to organize orderly functioning of the Mir orbital complex's control system before the start of the approach. The decision was made to go over to the stand-by procedure."

Dzhanibekov goes on to explain that the stand-by procedure has been tested, both on the ground and by the cosmonauts on Mir. He adds the information that "the Mir orbital complex and Kvant-2 have entered the zone" whereby the stand-by procedure can be effected. Subsequent remarks by Dzhanibekov are largely drowned out by other voices in the control room. He can be heard, however, noting that the cosmonauts "are waiting for information from the Flight Control Center on Kvant's condition, because information is not reaching the craft from Kvant. Vladimir Solovyev, who is now controlling the approach, has provided the information that Kvant's systems—for a reason that has not yet been clarified—have failed to fulfill the procedure. It is hard to say now what it is all about, but we can say that work is done for today. The crew has turned the Mir station towards the sun, to feed the buffer battery. That is a procedure for awaiting the development of further events. After completely processing the information, some decision will be made."

The correspondents sign off and promise to return with more information as available.

Flight Path Adjusted

LD0312125989 Moscow TASS in English 1234 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent from the mission control centre:

An adjustment of the flight path of the Kvant-2 module was made at 12:38 Moscow time today to put it into a new orbit on target to dock with the Mir station on December 6.

An analysis of telemetric data has shown that following the double-impulse manoeuvre on December 2 to adjust the module's orbit, the module automatically locked on a course to rendezvous with the Mir orbital complex.

However, the parameters of the mutual movement of the spacecraft at this stage went beyond the required allowance ensuring the necessary docking conditions. The approach process was automatically cut off in accordance with the accepted logic of the operation.

All systems of the Kvant-2 module and the Mir orbital station are functioning normally.

'Granat' Astrophysical Observatory Launched

Launch Announcement

LD0112205789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 2018 GMT on 1 December carries a live report from Baykonur about the launch of the "Granat" observatory. Radio correspondents Bezyayev and Lazarevich report that the proton rocket carrying the observatory was launched at 2021 GMT, according to schedule. They add that the rocket is only carrying a load of 4 tonnes, but is taking a lengthy trajectory in order to avoid the pull of the earth.

Further Details

LD0112213289 Moscow TASS in English 2120 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—An astrophysical observatory "Granat" was launched from the Baikonur Cosmodrome by a "Proton" carrier-rocket today.

The "Proton" carrier-rocket will initially deliver the space vehicle into an intermediate artificial earth satellite orbit, and then, in the first revolution, after the fourth stage propulsion units are switched on, it will be changed over to a working orbit.

The aim of the experiment is to study sources of x-ray and gamma-emission in the universe. Neutron stars, black holes, white dwarfs, remains of supernova star eruptions, the centre of our galaxy and also its interstellar medium and extra-galaxy objects will be explored.

The "Granat" scientific equipment was designed by scientists and specialists from the Soviet Union, France, Bulgaria and Denmark.

Orbital Parameters Given

LD0212035589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0212 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] [No dateline as received] At 2321 hours [2021 GMT] Moscow time on 1 December the Granat orbital observatory was launched in the Soviet Union by a Proton carrier rocket. The Granat international project provides for research into space sources of X- ray and mild gamma radiation.

The Granat orbital observatory, weighing four tons, was created at the S.A. Lavochkin Scientific Production Association of the USSR Ministry of General Machine-Building with the involvement of many of the country's design and industrial enterprises. It has on board scientific equipment created by scientists and specialists of the Soviet Union, France, Denmark, and the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

The Granat orbital observatory has been put into a high elliptical orbit of an earth satellite with the following parameters:

—maximum distance from the earth's surface (at the apogee) 200,000 kilometers;
—minimum distance from the earth's surface (at the perigee) 2,000 kilometers;
—initial period of revolution 98 hours;
—orbital inclination 51.6 degrees.

During the flight the ground stations of the Soviet Union's command and measurement complex will receive the scientific information coming from the orbital observatory and convey it to the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences for subsequent processing and distribution among the scientific institutes and laboratories of the USSR, France, Denmark, and Bulgaria taking part in the project.

Research Program Outlined

LD0212124389 Moscow TASS in English 1230 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—The astrophysical observatory Granat was launched into space from Baykonur cosmodrome by a Proton booster rocket at 2320, Moscow time, [2200 GMT] on Friday.

The Proton booster rocket at first ensured the delivery of the spacecraft to an intermediate orbit of the Earth's satellite. Then, during the first orbit, upon firing the engines of the fourth stage, it moved to a working orbit.

The principle purpose of the experiment is to research into x-ray and gamma-ray radiation sources in the universe. The objects of research include neutron stars, black holes, white dwarfs, the remains of super-nova flare-ups, the centre of our galaxy and its interstellar medium and extra Galactic objects.

The programme also envisages research into the background X-ray radiation of the universe and its properties as a whole.

The plotting of images and the revelation of structure in the nuclei of active galaxies is of great interest, experts believe.

The study of variable low-energy sources of x-ray and gamma-ray flare-ups—yet another purpose of the project—will be carried out by means of the Soviet instrument Podsolnukh (Sunflower). The instrument is a set of telescopes which are mounted on a rotating platform together with the videoinformation registration unit.

The scientific equipment of the Granat observatory was designed by scientists and specialists of the Soviet Union, France, Bulgaria, and Denmark.

Solar-cell batteries with silicon photoconverters are used as the source of electric power. The spacecraft's radio contact with the Earth will be ensured by means of low-directional transceiving antennas of the decimetre and centimetre wavebands installed on the orbital module.

The Art-P and Sigma telescopes, designed by Soviet and French specialists respectively, will make it possible to receive the images of x-ray radiation sources with a broad range of energies. The scientific equipment of the observatory also includes the traditional astronomical Art-S x-ray telescope.

To Function 8 Months

LD0212152689 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—The Granat space observatory launched from the Baykonur Cosmodrome on the night of December 1 to 2 is designed to function for eight months but may continue to operate much longer.

A major international project, Granat was created in the Soviet Union in close cooperation with specialists from France, Denmark, and Bulgaria. The scientific equipment includes seven telescopes that provide more than twenty "eyes" for space research.

The space observatory carries instruments to study gamma flares of cosmic radiation and other equipment. The overall weight of research equipment is 2.3 tonnes.

The orbital observatory will study various neutron stars and "black holes", the remains of super-nova flares, the inter-stellar medium of the Milky Way and the centre of the galaxy.

Extragalactic objects—intergalactic gas in the clusters of galaxies, quazars, the nuclei of active galaxies, and radio galaxies—are also of interest to researchers.

The background X-ray radiation of the universe will be studied and "weak" sources will be counted.

Research do not rule out that the Granat may provide new scientific data that will change our notion of the universe and of some processes taking place in it.

The service systems of the Granat must be checked and tuned, and scientific equipment will be calibrated and tested before December 15. The first data on the observation of the universe will then begin coming in from orbit.